BOISE STATE UNIVERSITY

College of Education

Policy and Procedure Manual

INTRODUCTION

This manual is designed to standardize the operations of the College of Education within the policies and operating framework of Boise State University. It is intended to support rather than supplant any information provided in university documents. Where appropriate, reference will be made to the appropriate data sources.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

MISSION & VISION STATEMENTS

ADMINISTRATIVE STRUCTURE AND PROCESSES

FACULTY GUIDELINES
  Academic Freedom
  Conflict Management
  Duty Period
  Faculty Office Hours
  Consulting and Absence from Campus
  Technology, Internet and Electronic Mail
  Personnel Files
  Faculty Workload
  Faculty Evaluation
  Promotion & Tenure
  Faculty Salary Guidelines

ACCREDITATION AND AFFILIATION WITH NATIONAL ORGANIZATIONS

THE MISSION

The mission of the College of Education at Boise State University is to prepare professionals using models that incorporate integrated teaching and learning practices to ensure high levels of knowledge and skill, commitment to democratic values, and the ability to work with a diverse population. As part of the only metropolitan institution in Idaho, the College of Education provides a collegial environment that supports a wide range of research and scholarly activity intended to advance knowledge and translate knowledge into improved practice at the local, national, and international levels. The College promotes the healthy development of society through outreach, partnership, and technical assistance activities that focus on organizational renewal. It advances the healthy development of individuals through a commitment to lifelong learning, wellness, personal excellence, and respect for individuals.

THE VISION

The College of Education will be a leader in integrated teaching and learning, the advancement of knowledge through research and scholarship, and the preparation of professionals who provide exemplary educational and related services to improve the lives of individuals in a changing and complex global society.

ADMINISTRATIVE STRUCTURE AND PROCESSES

The College of Education consists of eight academic departments: Bilingual Education, Counselor Education, Curriculum, Instruction and
Foundational Studies (CIFS), Early Childhood Studies, Educational Technology, Kinesiology, Literacy, and Special Education. The college houses five centers: Center for School Improvement and Policy Studies, Center for Educational and Multicultural Opportunities, Center for Biomechanics and Orthopedic Research (co-sponsored by the College of Engineering), Center for Physical Activity and Sport, and the Idaho Center for Economic Education (co-sponsored by the College of Business and Economics). The College of Education also works cooperatively with 17 departments in the colleges of Arts and Sciences, Business and Economics, and Social Sciences and Public Affairs to prepare candidates in programs leading to professional certification of educators. Programs with national accreditation include Teacher Education (NCATE), Athletic Training (CAAHEP), and Counselor Education (CACREP).

The administrative structure of Boise State University and the responsibilities of the various administrative officers and faculty are as follows:

**Office of the State Board of Education (OSBE).** The control and governance of Boise State University is vested in the State Board of Education as trustees (Section 33-3102, Idaho Code). The Board members are appointed by the Governor and the State Superintendent of Public Instruction also serves as an ex-officio member.

**President.** The President of Boise State University is selected by the SBOE. All other administrative officers are appointed on the recommendation of the President with the approval of the Board. The President has broad authority in the management and operation of the University.

**Provost.** The Provost and Vice-President for Academic Affairs works within the framework of responsibility established by the President and is accountable for the orderly development and promulgation of the academic, vocational-technical, and instructional services program. The Provost is responsible for the determination of policies and procedures related to the efficient operation of the University and is responsive to all special assignments received from the Office of the President.

**College of Education Dean.** The Dean provides academic and administrative leadership to the college. The Dean has responsibility for the organization and operation of the college. He/she oversees curriculum development, budget planning, preparation of course schedules, formation of policies and procedures that facilitate an effective academic environment and the continued success of the teaching process. To assist with the administration of the College, the Dean has a Leadership Team consisting of the Dean, Associate Dean, department chairs, Director of Teacher Education, center directors, and Doctoral Program Coordinator. Meetings are held twice each month. Responsibilities include:

- Developing, reviewing and updating on an annual basis, in concert with departments, a strategic plan as well as short- and long-term goals that are in harmony with the assigned role and mission of the College of Education.
- Advising the Dean on key issues related to the operation of the College and recommending policies and procedures that will promote and improve the College’s efficiency and effectiveness; recommending ad hoc committees to explore important issues; and, identifying items that need to be taken to the faculty for consideration and/or action;
- Providing a forum for effective communication that is both vertically and horizontally oriented; serving as a vehicle through which faculty/staff can present ideas and issues for action and resolution that impact the College as well as staying informed about matters that directly affect them;
- Serving as representatives and advocates for the faculty and associated programs in the College;
- Providing guidance on budget matters, including the allocation and reallocation of resources; and,
- Conducting formative and summative evaluations related to the college’s assigned mission and recommending changes for improvement across the College.

The Dean has the responsibility to provide leadership in the College’s planning efforts. In general, decisions will be made on the basis of group discussion, established goals, priorities and evaluation evidence.

**Search and Selection of Academic Dean (see BSU Policy 5380-B)**

**Faculty.** The faculty is organized into departments. One member of each department is appointed department chair in accordance with BSU 5370-B. The department head has administrative responsibilities to the department and reports to the dean of the college. In addition, each faculty member has the opportunity to contribute to educational policy. Educational policies are determined by the Faculty Senate as a result of recommendations from committees or individuals. The faculty constitution establishes principles of organization, authority and responsibilities of BSU faculty.

**Department Chairs.** In addition to teaching, scholarship and service responsibilities, Chairs function as unit academic administrative officers. They provide leadership necessary to develop a vision and mission for their department that is in harmony with the mission of the college and university. In addition, Chairs are responsible for:

- representing their Department in the established hierarchy from both a vertical and horizontal perspective;
- facilitating development of policies and procedures essential to the accomplishment of their department’s role and mission, including
matters pertaining to curriculum and instructional programs;

- recruiting, training, and managing faculty/staff;
- providing appropriate faculty, staff, and program development activities;
- creating a supportive environment for faculty, staff and students;
- conducting faculty/staff evaluations;
- seeking, managing and accounting for resources within BSU guidelines that provide for maximum productivity; and,
- establishing and maintaining appropriate records.

Selection of Department Head (see BSU Policy 5381-B)

Center Directors. Center Directors report directly to the Dean.

Administrator Evaluation. Each year the Dean is evaluated by the faculty through a standing committee that is appointed by the Provost (BSU 5385-B). The Associate Dean and Department Chairs (BSU 5386-B) will be evaluated by faculty/staff as part of their annual review.

Faculty Governance

The faculty shall provide recommendations on matters of educational policy within the limits prescribed by federal and state law, regulations of the OSBE, and policies of Boise State University. These include aspects of student life that relate directly to the educational process including the establishment of regulations concerning financial aid, academic performance, extracurricular activities, and freedom of action and expression. Furthermore, the faculty shall:

- recommend policies and procedures governing faculty appointment, tenure, and promotion.
- function through its representative body, the Faculty Senate; however, the faculty shall have the rights of initiative and referendum (see BSU Constitution, Article III, Section 1).
- determine policies and practices of their department/college within the limits approved by the OSBE (Article III: Powers and Authority, BSU Administrative Handbook)

Policy Determination

Major College decisions will be conducted as follows:

- Issues will be discussed in an open faculty forum;
- A motion will be made to determine the outcome by “voice vote”, “secret ballot” or “roll call.” All full-time faculty members shall be allowed to participate on a “one-person, one-vote” principle. If a voice vote is approved, there must be a quorum present; and,
- If a secret vote is desired, ballots shall be returned by a stipulated deadline to the dean’s office; and,
- A majority vote will rule in all such cases.

After a decision is reached, it is expected that all faculty will honor the conclusion, knowing that they had an opportunity to express various points of view as part of the process.

Standing Committees. Six standing committees, each with specific assignments designed to facilitate the role and mission of the College of Education have been established. These consist of:

Curriculum Committee

The College of Education Curriculum Committee is to review course or program recommendations of the various departments. Only those approved recommendations are forwarded to the appropriate university committee i.e. undergraduate matters to the BSU Curriculum Committee and graduate matters to the BSU Graduate Council.

Composition of the committee is as follows:

- a representative from each department of the College of Education;
- the College representative to the BSU Curriculum Committee;
- the College representative to the BSU Graduate Council;
- the Associate Dean of the College of Education.

The representatives of the BSU Curriculum Committee and the BSU Graduate Council and the Associate Dean are ex-officio voting members of the committee and are eligible for election as chair.

Promotion and Tenure Committee
The College of Education Promotion and Tenure Committee is to represent the interests of the faculty of the College in promotion and tenure decisions; review faculty applications for promotion and tenure and make recommendations to the Dean; facilitate fairness, equity and consistency across the College in promotion and tenure decisions; and, review non-tenured faculty during their third year at BSU to provide informed judgments about the adequacy of their progress toward tenure (Appendix D).

The committee, consisting of seven faculty members, will be appointed by the dean no later than October 1 of each year. Each department should attempt to select candidates in each of four categories and submit them to the dean by September 15. The categories will include representatives that are untenured, tenured, hold the rank of full professor and a student. The final selection will consist of approximately two thirds of the faculty being tenured, one third untenured, and at least two holding the rank of Professor. The student will be picked by the appropriate student government officer from a list compiled by the dean from names submitted by the department chairpersons. Tenured faculty will serve staggered three (3) year terms and non-tenured one (1) year. The student will serve for one (1) year. No faculty or student will be allowed to serve consecutive terms. The departmental affiliations of the members shall be approximately proportional to the relative sizes of the departments in the College. The Dean will convene the first meeting and define the charge for the committee. All votes of the committee shall be by secret ballot.

It is the responsibility of faculty members who wish to be considered for promotion and/or tenure and their department to provide all materials to the chair of the committee no later than October 15.

Salary Equity Committee

The Salary Equity Committee has the responsibility for making recommendations to the Dean regarding faculty salary distribution when discretionary funds become available. The committee shall consist of an elected representative from each department and the Associate Dean. See Faculty Salary Guidelines for more details on the process.

Teacher Education Coordinating Council (TECC)

The Teacher Education Coordinating Council is appointed by the Provost with the charge of coordinating teacher education across the University. The Council serves as an advisory committee to develop and recommend to the Dean of the College of Education policies regarding teacher education programs; coordinate regular program reviews and reports; monitor changing regulations and accreditation standards and making recommendations for program revisions to accommodate those requirements; review proposed major program changes; promote collaboration across departments and programs to increase the quality of teacher education programs; foster coherence in programs which prepare teachers; and, oversee program improvement activities in response to accreditation recommendations.

The Teacher Education Coordinating Council coordinates teacher education across the University. The Council develops and recommends policy to the Dean of the College of Education concerning professional preparation programs. Responsibilities of the Council are to:

- The Council is appointed by the Provost and Vice President of Academic Affairs and includes representatives from the College of Arts and Sciences (3), College of Social Sciences and Public Affairs (2), College of Education (6), and professional educators (2). The Deans nominate the representatives from their respective colleges to the Provost no later than April 1 of each year. The professional educators will be nominated by the Dean of the College of Education. Council members will be appointed for three-year terms, staggered to ensure continuity. The council is chaired by the Director of Teacher Education.

Graduate Program Coordinators Council (GPCC)

The GPCC provides governance for graduate programs in the College of Education. Duties include coordination and implementation of all graduate programs; generating and recommending major policy changes and procedures to the graduate faculty; serving as an advisory board to the programs coordinators and Associate Dean concerning graduate program issues; serving as curriculum committee for graduate programs; screening and admitting doctoral students; advertising and coordinating recruitment of all teacher education graduate assistants; and serving as the appeal board for graduate student appeals except for those matters related to initial teaching certification which will be assumed by the Professional Standards Committee.

The committee will be composed of the graduate program coordinators of each graduate program in the College of Education and the Associate Dean.

Technology Committee

The Technology committee has the duty to make recommendations to the Dean regarding issues of compatibility, curriculum integration, resource utilization, support system needs, and evaluation. The committee shall consist of representatives from each department and the College of Education Technology Coordinator.

FACULTY GUIDELINES

Academic Freedom

The major protection of academic freedom in American universities is tenure. If individuals have successfully completed the tenure process, indicating competence as teachers and scholars, they are guaranteed a position as long as they remain competent or do not commit some major act of misconduct. A possible exception to this would be if the SBOE were to declare a condition of “financial exigency” which includes the termination of programs or parts of programs.

If tenure is called into question, the faculty member is assured due process. In most tenure laws, the burden of proof for incompetence or
ethical violations is placed on those bringing the charges. Employers may not deny a benefit to a person on a basis that infringes his/her constitutionally protected interests, especially, his/her interest in freedom of speech. Since scholarship cannot flourish in an atmosphere of suspicion and distrust, the approach to classroom instruction is left to the discretion of the instructor. This does not mean that instructors are at liberty to conduct their classes without regard to the needs of the academic unit as desired departmental outcomes should guide individual course requirements.

In preparing to teach a course, individual syllabus must clearly define learning objectives and include a statement of means used to evaluate student achievement of desired results. Agreement on learning objectives is critical for multiple-section courses; however, the approach to reaching those objectives may vary by instructor.

Conflict Management

Conflict is best resolved at the lowest level possible. If someone approaches the Dean with concerns about departmental matters the department chair will be invited to join the conversation. If the matter involves another specific faculty member, that individual will be asked to join the discussion unless all parties are in the same department. In that case the department chair will be asked to handle the matter. If the faculty members are from different departments in the College, the Dean will convene a meeting that includes all concerned parties. Faculty are reminded that after exhausting College of Education internal guidelines they have recourse to the Faculty Grievance Committee as described in BSU policy 5375-b.

Duty Period

Faculty on an academic year or “nine month” appointment shall report for duty one week before the first day of classes in each fall term and serve through Commencement in the spring. Each is expected to be on duty until all assignments have been completed including the submission of grades to the Registrar’s office. Faculty members are entitled to all legal University holidays as well as the period between the end of the first academic term and the first working day for the spring semester. University, College and Departmental activities are scheduled during the week prior to the beginning of the fall and spring semesters at which all faculty are expected to attend.

Faculty Office Hours

Faculty shall keep a minimum of five regular office hours per week for the benefit of students and others desiring to conduct business. These hours are to be posted on their office door.

Consulting/Absence from Campus

Boise State University policy states that “faculty consulting is a matter of negotiation and agreement between the employee, his/her department chair and the Dean of the College” (BSU 5365-B). When considering consulting opportunities, faculty must understand that their first priority is to meet their full-time teaching, service and scholarship responsibilities and/or expectations. Once these activities have been negotiated and approved by the department chair and the dean, it is essential that faculty complete the essential paperwork required by the institution. This includes appropriate travel forms if faculty members are to be absent from scheduled duties during the contract period (BSU 5359-B). Even if a faculty or staff member is being paid to attend or is paying his/her own way, travel requests must still go through routine channels for approval (BSU 6900-C)

Technology, the Internet and Electronic Mail

Statewide policies on computer, the Internet and electronic mail usage shall be observed by all state employees. The following uses are acceptable and encouraged:

- Communications and information exchanges directly relating to the mission, charter and work tasks of the state agency;
- Announcements of state laws, procedures, hearings, policies, services or activities;
- Use for advisory, standards, research, analysis and professional society or development activities related to the user’s state governmental duties;
- Use in applying for or administering grants or contracts for state government research programs; and
- Occasional personal use of electronic mail in lieu of telephonic communication.
- All other uses not enumerated in points 1-5 are prohibited.

For penalties associated with violations refer to Executive Order # 98-05.

Personnel Files

Each department shall maintain an official personnel file for each of their employees. An employee may examine their own record during regular office hours. The following procedures shall be adhered to:
Documents which relate to job performance may be entered into faculty personnel files with appropriate notice to the faculty member(s). The affected faculty members have an opportunity to respond and/or appeal utilizing university policy.

Each employee may attach a concise statement in response to any item in his/her file.

Upon written request and payment of the cost of photocopying, an employee may obtain copies of any materials in their open file.

Materials cannot be copied without prior approval, except that, if the employee is a faculty member, the immediate supervisor may make copies for the purposes of annual evaluation and for tenure and performance review. Personnel can add to or update their file at any time prior to the review; however, should the faculty member choose not to do so, the review body can make a decision based on the available information.

Faculty Workload

FACULTY WORKLOAD POLICY
Approved by faculty vote 11/9/2007

I. DEFINITIONS
Members of the official faculty (as defined in BSU policy 5000-A, but excluding library faculty) who occupy full-time positions in academic departments, have academic rank, and are eligible for tenure, are referred to as members of the faculty or faculty members. The word scholarship is used to refer to all forms of research and creative activity carried out by a faculty member.

II. BASIC PRINCIPLES
The regularly assigned duties of all members of the faculty consist of teaching, scholarship, and service each academic year. The distribution of effort among teaching, scholarship, and service may vary from faculty member to faculty member and from fall semester to spring semester. However, the distribution of effort should always balance the scholarly and service interests of individual faculty members with their responsibility to deliver academic programs of high quality. This variation in the distribution of faculty effort is desirable because it allows optimization of faculty contributions to professional and institutional goals.

III. GENERAL DISTRIBUTION REQUIREMENTS
The work load of a faculty member is represented by 30 work-load units per academic year. These units must be distributed according to the following formula which is to be satisfied on an academic-year basis:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{Teaching:} & \quad 6 + x \quad \text{Example: Teaching:} & \quad 6 + 12 \\
\text{Scholarship:} & \quad 2 + y \quad \text{Scholarship:} & \quad 2 + 4 \\
\text{Service:} & \quad 2 + z \quad \text{Service:} & \quad 2 + 4 \\
30 & & 30
\end{align*}
\]

The sum of the work-load variables must equal 30 units. The example shows the work load for a faculty member who is assigned 18 units of teaching (60% of effort), 6 units of scholarship (20% of effort), and 6 units of service (20% of effort), for a total of 30 units over the academic year (100% of effort). Colleges and departments may place restrictions on the range of values allowed for any of the work-load variables x, y, and z, as long as the sum of x, y, and z remains equal to 30 units.

New Faculty Distribution Requirements
New faculty, defined as first year in the professoriate, will be required to meet the 30 work-load units per academic year. However, these units may be distributed differently with fewer units in teaching (i.e., to six units per semester) to enable these new faculty members to devote more work-load units to scholarship endeavors.

IV. WORK-LOAD VALUE OF TEACHING, SERVICE AND SCHOLARSHIP ACTIVITIES
A. Total Work Load: The work load for an individual faculty member may vary from the fall to the spring semester of an academic year, but must always total 30 units for the academic year.

B. Lecture Courses: A lecture course is an established on-campus course that consists entirely of class meetings devoted to the presentation and discussion of course content and student assignments. The work-load value (units) assigned to an undergraduate lecture course is normally identical to the number of course credits. An optional adjustment (increase or decrease in units) may be used by a department to take into account additional factors that significantly impact effort (such as large enrollment, help from graduate teaching assistants, service learning, hybrid courses, teaching courses off of the main campus, teaching outside area of emphasis, or large number of course preparations). Distance education courses are addressed in Section IV, D.

C. Clinical Courses: A clinical course is a course taught in a clinic, K-12 classroom, office, courtroom, field camp, or similar setting, with an emphasis on the practice of professional skills under the supervision of a university-authorized preceptor. The work-load value (units) assigned to an undergraduate or graduate clinical course is determined by each department subject to constraints imposed by the policies of the department and
college. If a specialized accrediting body places limits on the teaching of clinical courses in a particular program, then these limits must be respected by college and department work-load policies.

Effort in the teacher education programs within the College of Education is defined by two factors: the amount of time spent in the field and the number of students supervised. Amount of time should be limited to 20% of faculty effort (i.e., three workload units). An optional adjustment (increase or decrease in units) may be used by a department to take into account additional factors that significantly impact effort (such as work in professional development schools, initial establishment of partner relationships, multiple sites, individual students who require additional supervision, etc.).

Guidelines for assigning workload units to clinical supervision are based on FTE generated by student credit hours. For example a typical three credit undergraduate course with an enrollment of 30 students produces 6 FTE. Therefore, one FTE equates to 0.5 workload units. The following table serves as a guide to determining workload values for clinical supervision in teacher education programs.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Clinical Course</th>
<th>Credits</th>
<th>FTE per student</th>
<th>Workload Units per student</th>
<th>Number of students required to generate 1.0 workload unit</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Secondary Block I</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>0.035</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary Block II</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>0.075</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elementary Professional Year A</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Teaching</td>
<td>14-16</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For example, a faculty member in the Department of Curriculum, Instruction, and Foundational Studies is assigned to supervise 4 student teachers and 3 secondary block II interns.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Clinical Course</th>
<th>Credits</th>
<th>FTE</th>
<th>Workload Units</th>
<th>Number of students</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Secondary Block II</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3\times 0.15 = 0.45</td>
<td>3/15=0.20</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Teaching</td>
<td>14-16</td>
<td>4\times 1.0 = 4.0</td>
<td>4/2 =2.0</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>4.45</td>
<td>2.20</td>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For programs outside of teacher education, the department will follow the university policy and create a table that clearly communicates the basis for assigning workload units to faculty members.

D. Other Courses: The university offers a large number of undergraduate and graduate courses that are not easily classified as lecture or clinical courses, such as independent study, foreign study, practicum or internship, conference or workshop, seminar, readings and conference, directed research, courses taught by distance methods, laboratory courses, and courses that include a laboratory (or similar requirement) that is not assigned separate credit. The work-load value (units) assigned to each of these types of courses is determined by each department subject to constraints imposed by the policies of the department and college.

In the College of Education, a field experience, practicum, or internship that stands alone or is included in a lecture course may merit credit in a faculty member's workload if that faculty member is engaged in grading/evaluating fieldwork, fieldwork placement, conducting seminars, or similar tasks.

E. Graduate Culminating Activities: Effort expended by a faculty member on graduate culminating activities (e.g., comprehensive examination, seminar, thesis, project, dissertation) is included as part of the teaching work load, but only to the extent that the culminating activities are represented by registered academic credits. The work-load value (units) assigned to a graduate culminating activity is determined by each department subject to constraints imposed by the policies of the department and college.

The following table serves as a guide for assigning workload units for culminating activities:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Graduate Culminating Activity</th>
<th>Credits</th>
<th>Number of Students Required for 1.0 FTE</th>
<th>Equivalent Workload Units per student for Committee Member</th>
<th>Equivalent Workload Units per student for Committee Chair</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Comprehensive Exams (masters)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project/Thesis</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>0.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comprehensive Exams (doctoral)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0.04</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
F. Departmental Administrative Assignments: The work load represented by departmental administrative assignments (e.g., chair, director, coordinator) during the academic year is included in the service work load. The work-load value (units) assigned to an administrative assignment is determined by each department subject to constraints imposed by the policies of the department and college.

Chair assignment workload allocation shall be a minimum of 12 workload units in service per academic year. Coordinators and directors of programs and centers and offices (e.g., graduate coordinator, athletic training education program director, etc.) workload units are defined and negotiated with the chair of the department and/or the dean of the college.

G. General Student Advising: The work load represented by general student advising that is not associated with a particular course or graduate culminating activity is included in the service work load. The work-load value (units) assigned to an administrative assignment is determined by each department subject to constraints imposed by the policies of the department and college.

Anyone receiving credit for general student advising in the College of Education is expected to be available, be knowledgeable of programs, and provide accurate information. Faculty members will be acknowledged in workload units for a percentage of effort devoted to advising. For example, faculty members who spend 20% of their time advising over the course of the year will be allocated 6 workload units for that work.

H. Scholarship: Faculty must have work load units allocated that enable them to meet the expectations of the University, College, and Department for tenure, promotion, and five-year review (refer to relevant guidelines).

V. DEVELOPMENT OF WORK-LOAD POLICIES AND PROCEDURES WITHIN THE COLLEGES AND DEPARTMENTS

The following is from the University Workload Policy.

A. Each college and department is responsible for developing and maintaining written work-load policies and procedures that have been approved by the college dean. There must be consistency within the hierarchy of policies and procedures; that is, the department policies and procedures must be consistent with the college policies and procedures, and the college policies and procedures must be consistent with this (university) policy.

B. At a minimum, the policies and procedures developed by a department must require the following: (1) uniform application to all faculty members of the department; (2) for each faculty member, joint development (by the faculty member and department chair) of an annual written work-load description that is approved by the department chair and college dean prior to the start of the academic year; (3) linkage of the annual work-load description to the annual faculty evaluation; and (4) definition of a mechanism for implementing work-load modifications during the academic year as the need arises.

C. If the workloads of individual faculty members and/or collective faculty within a department/unit exceed the 30 unit per faculty member limit set by this policy, the appropriate chair, dean, or provost will re-examine workload assignments and bring them into conformity with this policy. If necessity demands that faculty workload exceeds the 30 unit limit, faculty members will receive additional compensation.

VI. WORK-LOAD ASSIGNMENT IN THE CASE OF A SALARY BUYOUT

As described in university policy 6317-C, a faculty member can be paid (in whole or in part) by a sponsored project during an academic year under an arrangement known as a salary buyout. In the case of a salary buyout, the work load of the faculty member continues to total 30 units for the academic year, but the work-load distribution now includes a prescribed number of units assigned to the sponsored project, and it may not be possible to meet the distribution requirements among teaching, scholarship, and service stated in section III. The percentage of the total academic-year salary of the faculty member paid by the sponsored project is the same as the percentage of the total academic-year work load assigned to the sponsored project.

VII. EXCEPTIONS

This policy does not apply to faculty members on sabbatical leave, military leave, or family medical leave.

FACULTY EVALUATION POLICY

College of Education

Approved by faculty vote 5/2/2008

Purpose

This policy is designed to address three purposes. First, it establishes College of Education policies for the annual evaluations of all faculty members.
members. Second, it provides faculty members, department chairs, promotion and tenure committees, and the dean of the college with guidance in decisions regarding faculty development, faculty evaluation, salary determination, and promotion and/or tenure. Third, it facilitates consistency in evaluation procedures across all departments. These guidelines are companion to the College of Education Promotion and Tenure Policy and Procedures, the College of Education Faculty Workload Policy, and university policy 5310-B Annual Faculty Performance Evaluation.

Faculty Evaluation

Every tenure track faculty member in the college is to be evaluated annually. The faculty evaluation process should be initiated by the individual faculty member early in the spring semester through a written self-evaluation that provides evidence of contributions in teaching, scholarly activity and service during the preceding calendar year. Faculty roles and expectations should be established annually and documented individually at the departmental level. The department chair will consider the faculty member’s self-evaluation and negotiated role within the department, as well as other information relevant to faculty performance, to prepare the annual faculty evaluation in compliance with BSU Policy 5310-B.

Faculty members are expected to build on their strengths and contribute constructively to the welfare of the college. Given the complexity of programs in the college, differentiated faculty loads, limited resources, and the diversity of interests and talents among the faculty members, each evaluation of a faculty member must be individualized. The specific criteria used in faculty evaluation should be tailored to personal talents as well as to campus, community, and professional needs. Contributions in teaching, scholarship, and service should be shaped by both the needs of the institution and the talents and interests of the individual.

The specific role that the individual has negotiated and/or been assigned within the department, the college, and the institution must be considered in evaluation. These negotiated roles shall inform the annual evaluation process, and should be incorporated in promotion and tenure determinations.

To standardize the review of faculty evaluations across departments within the College of Education, all faculty will be evaluated annually in the three areas of teaching, scholarship, and service. An overall summary of the faculty member’s contributions in each area should be based on the four-point scale described below. Each department should determine the specific expected levels of contribution in each area. In addition, a single overall concluding summary evaluation of the faculty member synthesizing the contributions in each of the three areas should be based on the same four-point scale (With Distinction, Exceeds Expectations, Meets Expectations, Needs Improvement).

The Four Level Scale

Departmental interpretations of the performance levels described below should reflect differences among various disciplines and provide for multiple ways to achieve at each level.

**Teaching.**

- **With Distinction (4)** - Extraordinary teaching at a level not expected to be sustained on an annual basis.
- **Exceeds Expectations (3)** - Exemplary teaching at a level sustainable on an annual basis.
- **Meets Expectations (2)** - Competent teaching that fulfills department needs and is sustainable on an annual basis.
- **Needs Improvement (1)** - Teaching that falls short of the expectations for teaching effectiveness.

**Scholarly Activity.**

- **With Distinction (4)** - Extraordinary scholarly accomplishment and recognition, including high visibility within the profession, at a level not expected to be sustained on an annual basis.
- **Exceeds Expectations (3)** - Exemplary scholarly accomplishment, including high visibility within the profession, at a level sustainable on an annual basis.
- **Meets Expectations (2)** - Competent scholarly productivity that brings recognition to the individual and university at a level that could be sustained on an annual basis (e.g., one publication per year).
- **Needs Improvement (1)** - Scholarly productivity that falls short of the expectations for scholarly productivity (e.g., less than one publication per year).

**Service**

- **With Distinction (4)** - Extraordinary service, including high visibility and/or leadership within the profession or university at a level not expected to be sustained on an annual basis.
- **Exceeds Expectations (3)** - Exemplary service, including high visibility and/or leadership within the profession or university, at a level sustainable on an annual basis.
- **Meets Expectations (2)** - Competent service, including visibility and/or leadership within the profession or university, that could be sustained on an annual basis.
- **Needs Improvement (1)** - Service to the profession or university that falls short of the expectations for professional service.

Teaching, Scholarly Activity, and Service
Teaching. Teaching is a critical role for faculty members, especially in the College of Education. Faculty members should provide evidence of sustained instructional effectiveness and a commitment to effective teaching. Examples of acceptable evidence of this include, but are not limited to, those delineated in the College of Education Promotion and Tenure Policy and Procedures.

Scholarly Activity. Faculty members are expected to demonstrate a systematic and sustained level of achievement through scholarly, creative, or research activities. This work includes a critical review process and/or professional recognition by scholars in the field. Examples of acceptable scholarly activity include, but are not limited to, those delineated in COE Promotion and Tenure Policy and Procedures.

Service. Service includes intellectual work based on the individual faculty member’s field of expertise that results in professional contributions of substance to the department, college, and/or university; to the profession; and to the community. Examples of acceptable service include, but are not limited to, those delineated in the College of Education Promotion and Tenure Policy and Procedures.

Course and Faculty Evaluation

Every department in the College of Education shall standardize its course evaluation forms as follows.

1. The course evaluation form should be titled Course and Faculty Evaluation Form.
2. The last item on the Course and Faculty Evaluation Form should be consistent for every department within the College of Education. That item should be as follows.

   Overall, the professor of this course merits a rating of

   5 (Excellent)
   4 (Good)
   3 (Acceptable)
   2 (Needs Improvement)
   1 (Unacceptable)

3. Additional Course and Faculty Evaluation Form components, including additional five-point Likert scale items as well as any narrative items, should be developed specific to and consistent with each department’s unique needs.

Timeline for Performance Evaluation:

-February 1 Faculty member submits complete written evidence to department chair
-March 15 Prior to this date the department chair will schedule a meeting with each faculty member to discuss the member’s annual report of activities and the chair’s written evaluation of such activities. If the faculty member does not agree with the chair’s evaluation, he/she has the prerogative to write an addendum. The finalized document shall be signed by the faculty member and department chair and placed in the official personnel file of the faculty member.
-April 1 Chair sends copy of the finalized document to the faculty member and dean. The dean shall forward the evaluation to the Provost and Executive Vice-President.

PROMOTION AND TENURE POLICY AND PROCEDURES

College of Education

Revised by COE Faculty 5-1-11; approved 5-2-2008

Purpose

This policy is designed to systematize the College of Education’s promotion and tenure procedures, and supplements the College of Education Faculty Evaluation Guidelines policy. These promotion and tenure guidelines interpret and clarify university policies for promotion (BSU 4340-II.B) and tenure (BSU 4370) specific to the role and mission of the College of Education.

Preamble

Tenure and promotion in the College of Education is the natural consequence of faculty members contributing productive and valued work for the good of the university, profession, and community. Faculty members are held to high standards in teaching, scholarly activity and service. The three areas are connected in integral ways by a broad, encompassing vision of the nature of intellectual work. The scholar is one who
steps back from his/her investigations, looks for connections, builds bridges between theory and practice, and communicates his/her knowledge effectively to students and to the larger community. Knowledge may be acquired through research, through synthesis, through practice, and through teaching (Boyer, 1990).

When a faculty member seeks promotion and/or tenure, college administrators and the College of Education Promotion and Tenure Committee should consider the complexity of programs in the college, differentiated teaching loads, limited resources, and the diversity of interests and abilities among the faculty members in reaching recommendations concerning that candidate. Faculty members should build on their strengths as they develop professional agendas. The recommendations of college administrators and the college’s Promotion and Tenure Committee on candidates should acknowledge both the candidate’s personal talents as well as the needs of the university, profession, and community.

The following guidelines describe a process that, when fairly and consistently administered, holds faculty members accountable and rewards them for their professional contributions.

1. Purposes of the College of Education Promotion and Tenure Committee

1.1 To represent the interests of the faculty of the college in promotion and tenure recommendations.

1.2 To review faculty applications for promotion and tenure and make subsequent recommendations to the dean of the college.

1.3 To facilitate fairness, equity and consistency across the college in promotion and tenure decisions.

1.4 To review each non-tenured faculty member during the third year of full employment at the university, and provide the faculty member with informed judgment and guidance concerning progress toward tenure.

1.5 To conduct a thorough review of this policy every five years (or as needed).

2. Structure and Procedures of the College of Education Promotion and Tenure Committee

2.1 By September 15 of each year, each department shall elect from its ranks potential members for the College of Education Promotion and Tenure Committee. Whenever possible, departments shall seek potential committee members who represent each of three categories: (a) faculty members who are non-tenured from those departments that have no candidates for promotion and tenure, (b) faculty members who are tenured, and (c) faculty members holding the rank of Professor. The names of these department nominees are submitted to the dean, who will then appoint a College of Education Promotion and Tenure Committee from the names submitted no later than October 1.

2.2 The final composition of the committee shall consist of one (1) faculty member from each department and one (1) student (see Section 2.4). The committee must include one (1) tenured member from each candidate’s department, one (1) non-tenured member, and one (1) student representative. At least two (2) members must hold the rank of Professor. Each member of the committee has one (1) equal vote on all matters.

After the official college committee has been appointed and before the first meeting convened by the dean, each department chair may nominate to the Dean one (1) non-tenured faculty member to serve in an ex-officio capacity to the COE P&T committee. Ex-officio members are not voting members and are bound by the rules of confidentiality.

2.3 Tenured faculty members shall serve staggered two (2) year terms. To maintain continuity within the committee, each year at least two (2) tenured members of the committee shall be serving their second year. Non-tenured faculty members shall serve one (1) year terms. No faculty member shall serve consecutive terms.

2.4 The dean should request the name of a student representative for the college committee from the Associated Students of Boise State University. This student member will serve a one (1) year term.

2.5 The dean should convene the first meeting of the committee and define its charge.

2.6 The College of Education Promotion and Tenure Committee should base its recommendation about a candidate on a variety of sources of information. These should include the following.

2.6.1 The candidate’s Promotion and Tenure Portfolio (as described below).

2.6.2 The written report of the department Promotion and Tenure Committee (or its equivalent). (This department level report is to be submitted directly to the College of Education Promotion and Tenure Committee and added to the candidate’s
portfolio.)

2.6.3 The written recommendation for tenure and/or promotion from the department chair. (This department level report is to be submitted directly to the College Promotion and Tenure Committee and added to the portfolio).

2.6.4 The external review results.

2.7 No additional materials may be added to a candidate’s portfolio without the consent of the candidate.

2.8 All votes of the College of Education Promotion and Tenure Committee shall be by secret ballot. The specific vote count will be recorded by the committee chair, and supplemented by a written rationale for the committee’s recommendation.

2.9 The College of Education Promotion and Tenure Committee will prepare and submit a letter to the dean noting the committee vote and rationale. This letter will accompany the candidate’s portfolio to the dean.

3. Criteria for Recommendations

3.1 The recommendations of the College of Education Promotion and Tenure Committee must be based on the professional judgment of the committee members regarding the significance and achievement of the candidate’s contributions in teaching, scholarly activity, and service. To be recommended for tenure and/or to be promoted, each faculty member is expected to demonstrate contributions of substance in each area. Contributions in each area are shaped by both the needs of the institution and the talents and interests of the faculty member. Therefore, the tenure and/or promotion recommendations of the committee should incorporate consideration of the annual role(s) that the individual has negotiated and/or been assigned within the department, the college, and the institution. To this end, candidates should provide documentation of annually negotiated departmental roles for the time under review in the Promotion and Tenure portfolio. (see College of Education Work Load Policy).

3.2 Tenure. The outcomes of tenure decisions substantially impact the long term quality of the college and university. Tenure recommendations are based on both the candidate’s past performance in teaching, scholarly activity, and service, as well as on an assessment of the candidate’s potential for continued excellence and contribution in these areas. Successful candidates for tenure will provide evidence of an established record of success as an excellent teacher, an ongoing agenda of scholarly activity, and a commitment to productive service to the university, the profession, and the community.

It is anticipated that for faculty members at the rank of Assistant Professor, tenure and promotion to Associate Professor typically would occur simultaneously.

3.2.1 Criteria for tenure.

3.2.1.1 Earned doctorate (nationally recognized excellence in the field may be substituted for the terminal degree).

3.2.1.2 Sustained effectiveness and a continuing commitment to teaching (see Appendix A, Teaching Activity Worksheet).

3.2.1.3 A record of scholarly activity, including peer-reviewed publications (see Appendix B, Scholarly Activity Worksheet).

3.2.1.4 A record of service contributions, both locally and nationally (see Appendix C, Service Activity Worksheet).

3.2.1.5 Five years of full-time experience in an academic rank at an institution of higher learning. Faculty members become eligible to apply for tenure during the fifth year of service on the Official Faculty. A faculty member who is given credit for prior service at the time of initial employment may be considered for tenure no earlier than during his or her third full year of employment at Boise State University except under extraordinary circumstance.

3.3 Promotion. Successful candidates for promotion must demonstrate excellence in teaching, scholarly activity, and service.

3.3.1 Criteria for the rank of Assistant Professor (BSU Policy 4340).

3.3.2 Criteria for Promotion to Associate Professor

3.3.2.1 Earned doctorate (nationally recognized excellence in the field may be substituted for the terminal degree).
3.3.2.2  Sustained effectiveness and a continuing commitment to teaching (see Appendix A, Teaching Activity Worksheet).

3.3.2.3  A record of scholarly activity, including peer-reviewed journals (see Appendix B, Scholarly Activity Worksheet).

3.3.2.4  A record of service contributions, both locally and nationally (see Appendix C, Service Activity Worksheet).

3.3.2.5  Five years of full-time experience at an accredited institution of higher education but no earlier than during his or her third full year of employment at Boise State University except under extraordinary circumstance.

3.3.3  Criteria for promotion to Professor. University guidelines emphasize that promotion to Professor should be reserved for individuals who are “truly and demonstrably outstanding among their peers” and who have “achieved additional distinction clearly above that of an Associate Professor” (BSU Policy 4340-II.C). In the College of Education, promotion to Professor recognizes individuals who have made substantive contributions to their fields through consistently excellent teaching, a sustained agenda of prominent scholarly activity, and productive service of high visibility and significance.

3.3.3.1  Earned doctorate (nationally recognized excellence in the field may be substituted for the terminal degree).

3.3.3.2  Sustained effectiveness and a continuing commitment to teaching (see Appendix A, Teaching Activity Worksheet).

3.3.3.3  Scholarly activities that result in significant contributions to their field (see Appendix B, Scholarly Activity Worksheet).

3.3.3.4  Significant service to the profession, both locally and nationally, related to professional interests and expertise (see Appendix C, Service Activity Worksheet).

3.3.3.5  Eight years of full-time experience in an academic rank at an accredited institution but no earlier than during his or her third full year of employment at Boise State University except under extraordinary circumstance.

4. External Reviews

4.1  All candidates for tenure and/or promotion to Associate Professor or Professor will participate in an external review as follows.

4.2  The candidate’s department will obtain a minimum of two and a maximum of five external letters of evaluation from a list of impartial experts who are held with respect in academe, and are either recently or at present working in the candidate’s field at other universities (or the equivalent).

4.3  This list of potential external reviewers will specifically exclude (a) former and current co-workers, (b) co-authors, (c) major academic professors and/or advisors, (d) individuals who had/have financial or contractual obligations with the candidate, and/or (e) other persons with whom the candidate has or has had an established working or personal relationship.

4.4  Candidates may submit qualifications of outside reviewers and suggest names of potential external reviewers to the department. However, the department chair, or a tenured department member designated by the chair, will ultimately solicit the external reviewers.

4.5  The names of the external reviewers will be identified only to members of the department and college Promotion and Tenure Committees, the dean, and the provost.

4.6  Each external evaluator should be tenured and at the rank of Associate Professor or Professor (or the equivalent) at his/her institution.

4.7  The department will send to at least three external reviewers a letter requesting external review of the candidate for tenure and/or promotion. This letter should provide the following information:

4.7.1  An introductory statement about the candidate and the tenure and/or promotion process at Boise State, and a request for the external reviewer to participate in the candidate’s tenure and/or promotion process.

4.7.2  A statement about who is not eligible to serve as a reviewer: (a) former and current co-workers, (b) co-authors, (c) major academic professors and/or advisors, (d) individuals who had/have financial or contractual obligations with the candidate, and/or (e) other persons with whom the candidate has or has had an established working or personal relationship.

4.7.3  A statement to indicate that all letters from external reviewers will be treated as confidential.
4.7.4 The requested deadline for receipt of the letter from the external reviewer.

4.7.5 A copy of the candidate’s letter of application for tenure and/or promotion from the Promotion and Tenure portfolio.

4.7.6 A copy of the candidate’s vita and other pertinent information from the candidate’s file (e.g., reprints, articles).

4.7.7 A request that the external reviewer (a) note the nature of his/her acquaintance with the candidate, (b) comment on the candidate’s recognition or standing among her/his peers, and (c) provide detailed assessments of the significance and contribution to the profession of the candidate’s scholarly activity and professional contributions within the context of the candidate’s defined workload obligations in the areas of teaching, scholarly activity, and service.

4.7.8 A request that the external reviewer submit a copy of his/her vita along with the review.

4.8 Upon request, an external reviewer may be provided with a copy of any materials in the candidate’s Promotion and Tenure Portfolio vita, as well as any other supporting materials.

4.9 The department chair, or a tenured department member designated by the chair, is to insert the following documents into the candidate’s portfolio binder: (a) two to five letters from external reviewers, (b) each reviewer’s current vita, (c) the department’s letter sent to the reviewers requesting the review (as detailed in Section 4.7), and (d) a detailed description of the procedure used to solicit the candidate’s reviewers. These documents will be included in the candidate’s Promotion and Tenure Portfolio until the review process is complete, at which time they will be removed from the portfolio before it is returned to the candidate. These external letters of review are to be incorporated in the evaluation of the candidate by the department Promotion and Tenure Committee, the department chair, the College of Education Promotion and Tenure Committee, and the dean of the college.

5. The Promotion and Tenure Portfolio

5.1 The basic structure of the Promotion and Tenure Portfolio should include the following sections.

5.1.1 College of Education Eligibility and Summary Recommendations Form.

5.1.2 Letter of Request. This letter (two page maximum) shall note the specific nature of the candidate’s request (tenure, promotion, rank). The letter should also highlight the applicant’s productivity and major contributions in Teaching, Scholarly Activity and Service. Each of these three areas should be clearly identified and addressed within this Letter of Request.

5.1.3 The Promotion and Tenure Vita (see Section 6)

5.1.4 The annual statements of the role(s) that the faculty member has negotiated and/or been assigned within the department, college, and the institution.

5.1.5 All annual department chair evaluations, along with all annual Tenure Progress Review evaluations from the department Promotion and Tenure Committee, and the three year Tenure Progress Review from the college Promotion and Tenure Committee.

5.1.6 Evidence of teaching effectiveness. In this section of the Promotion and Tenure Portfolio the candidate should include evidence of effectiveness in Teaching. The Teaching section of the Promotion and Tenure Portfolio should include the following information.

5.1.6.1 A listing of all courses taught within the last three years, including the student enrollment in and credit hours of each.

5.1.6.2 The complete statistical analyses of all courses taught within the last three years.

5.1.6.3 At least two complete sets of course evaluation student narrative comments from classes within the past academic year.

5.1.6.4 Additional documentation of teaching effectiveness.

5.1.6.5 A 1-2 page narrative introduction, written by the candidate, to “teaching effectiveness,” placed at the
5.1.7 Evidence of scholarly activity. In this section of the portfolio the candidate should include a summary compilation of all scholarly contributions to date in reverse chronological order, prepared in APA format. Representative hard copy samples of publications should accompany the Promotion and Tenure Portfolio in a separate binder. The Scholarly Activity section of the Promotion and Tenure Portfolio should be organized as follows.

5.1.7.1 Publications.

5.1.7.1.1 Journals: refereed.

5.1.7.1.1.1 National and international.
5.1.7.1.1.2 Regional and local.
5.1.7.1.1.3 Invited.

5.1.7.1.2 Journals: non-refereed.

5.1.7.1.2.1 National and international.
5.1.7.1.2.2 Regional and local.
5.1.7.1.2.3 Invited.

5.1.7.1.3 Books.

5.1.7.1.3.1 Authored.
5.1.7.1.3.2 Edited.
5.1.7.1.3.3 Chapters.

5.1.7.1.4 Other publications.

5.1.7.2 Scholarly presentations.

5.1.7.2.1 National and international.
5.1.7.2.2 Regional, state or local.
5.1.7.2.3 Invited.
5.1.7.2.4 Other scholarly presentations.

5.1.7.3 Grants.

5.1.7.3.1 Funded.
5.1.7.3.2 Not funded.

5.1.7.4 Other scholarly activity.

5.1.7.5 A 1-2 page narrative introduction, written by the candidate, to “scholarly activity,” placed at the beginning of Section 5.1.7. Possible topics for the introduction might include the candidate’s area(s) of scholarly focus and nature of research, reflections on scholarly activities, determination of first authorship in collaborative publications, nature of collaborative authorship (including writing responsibilities when candidate is not first author), the quality of publications (such as acceptance rates, impact factors, and/or circulation rates for journals), justification of interpreting a specific non-refereed journal as “equivalent” in value to a peer-reviewed journal, etc. This introduction is also to include a detailed description of any scholarly activity associated with a negotiated workload different from a 20% allocation for research.

5.1.8 Evidence of service contributions. In this section of the portfolio the candidate should include a compilation of all service contributions to date in reverse chronological order. The Service section of the Promotion and Tenure Portfolio should
be organized as follows.

5.1.8.1 Service to the university.

5.1.8.1.1 University service (noting committees chaired, committee memberships, and committee outcomes).

5.1.8.1.2 College service (noting committees chaired, committee memberships, and committee outcomes).

5.1.8.1.3 Department service (noting committees chaired, committee memberships, and committee outcomes).

5.1.8.2 Service to the profession.

5.1.8.2.1 National and international.

5.1.8.2.2 Regional and state.

5.1.8.2.3 Local.

5.1.8.3 Service to the community (professionally relevant).

5.1.8.4 A 1-2 page narrative introduction, written by the candidate, to “service contributions,” placed at the beginning of Section 5.1.8. Possible topics for the introduction might include the candidate’s philosophy of service, reflections on service contributions, developing key service activities, etc. This introduction is also to include a detailed description of any service activity associated with a negotiated workload different from a 20% allocation for service.

5.2 Additional supporting documentation may be included in the Promotion and Tenure Portfolio at the discretion of the candidate. Candidates should be judicious in including additional documentation, as voluminous materials may inadvertently obfuscate other documentation materials of greater significance.

6. The Promotion and Tenure Portfolio Vita. Candidates for tenure and/or promotion should include in the portfolio a vita standardized for this purpose. This Promotion and Tenure Vita serves as an overview of the complete Promotion and Tenure Portfolio.

6.1 The Promotion and Tenure Vita should include the following components.

6.1.1 Demographic information (name, professional address, contact information, etc.).

6.1.2 Current and former professional positions and ranks, in reverse chronological order.

6.1.3 Teaching assignments. This should include in reverse chronological a semester-by-semester listing of all courses taught over the previous three years, including (a) the student enrollment in each and (b) the “overall” instructor statistical summary evaluation for each course.

6.1.4 Scholarly activity. This should include a reverse chronological listing of scholarly achievements.

6.1.5 Service. This section should be organized in reverse chronological order, and by type of service (university, profession, community).

6.2 Each candidate is to submit a secured and un-editable electronic copy (e.g., a .pdf file) of the P&T Vita to the department chair.

7. The Promotion and Tenure Recommendation Process and Timelines in the College of Education

7.1 By September 1, each candidate for promotion and/or tenure will submit to the department Promotion and Tenure Committee the names of at least five impartial external reviewers from the same or related discipline as the candidate.

7.2 By September 15 each candidate will submit the Promotion and Tenure Portfolio to the department chair, or a tenured department member designated by the chair, who will then forward the materials to the department Promotion and Tenure Committee. Each candidate is also to submit a secured and un-editable electronic copy of the Promotion and Tenure Portfolio Vita to the department chair.

7.3 By October 1 the department Promotion and Tenure Committee shall review each candidate’s portfolio, provide a written recommendation to the department chair and to the College of Education Promotion and Tenure Committee, and in writing notify each candidate of the committee’s decision, accompanied by a rationale for this decision. The specific vote count of the department
committee for each candidate will be recorded and reported to the department chair and to the College of Education Promotion and Tenure Committee. These written documents will be included in each candidate’s portfolio. The candidate will acknowledge the committee recommendation by signing the Eligibility and Summary Recommendations Form. The candidate may attach a response to the committee’s recommendation if desired.

7.4 By October 15 the department chair will review the portfolio and the recommendation of the department committee for each candidate, provide a written recommendation to the College Promotion and Tenure Committee, including a rationale for that recommendation, and provide each candidate with the written recommendation. The candidate will acknowledge the chair’s recommendation by signing the Eligibility and Summary Recommendations Form. The candidate may attach a response if desired.

7.5 By December 1 the College Promotion and Tenure Committee will review the portfolio and the recommendations from (a) the department Promotion and Tenure Committee and (b) the department chair for each candidate, and will notify each candidate in writing of the committee’s recommendation, including a rationale for that recommendation. The committee will provide a written recommendation for each candidate to the dean, accompanied by a rationale for that recommendation. The specific college committee vote count on each candidate will be recorded and reported to the dean.

7.6 By December 15 the College of Education Promotion and Tenure Committee will forward all promotion and tenure materials to the dean of the college.

7.7 By January 15 the dean of the college will review each candidate’s portfolio and all recommendations, and make a recommendation to the Provost and Vice-President for Academic Affairs. The dean will notify each candidate in writing of this recommendation, including specific areas of strength and weakness.

7.8 If a mandatory tenure decision is not required, a candidate may withdraw an application for promotion and/or tenure at any stage of the promotion and/or tenure process. However, faculty members are required to seek tenure no later than their sixth year of service at Boise State University. If continuous appointment is not awarded by that time the University has the option to issue a terminal contract.

8. Appeals of Recommendations

8.1 Recommendation of the College Promotion and Tenure Committee. If the college committee’s recommendation is that tenure and/or promotion should be denied, within five days of the notification the candidate may request a meeting with the committee. If requested, the committee must schedule a meeting within five working days of the request. The candidate must base any appeal on the established criteria for promotion or tenure. The candidate may present additional evidence. Following the meeting with the candidate, the committee may decide to revote on the recommendation for that candidate. Only committee members who are present at this appeal meeting may participate in any committee decision to revote. This vote requires a quorum of the committee to be in attendance.

8.2 Recommendation of the Dean. If the dean’s recommendation is that tenure and/or promotion should be denied, within five days of the notification the candidate may request a meeting with the dean. The dean must schedule the meeting within five working days of receiving the request. The candidate must base any appeal on the established criteria for promotion or tenure. The candidate may present additional evidence.

9. Tenure Status Review for Tenured Faculty

9.1 Every five years each tenured faculty member will be reviewed.

9.1.2 Each year the Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs notifies departmental administrators, in writing, as to the members of their units whose performance is to be reviewed during the year and as to the dates by which review procedures are to be completed. Each administrator communicates the names of these individuals to the unit’s faculty members and asks each faculty member to indicate whether the performance of the faculty member who is under review should be questioned (BSU Policy 4380).

9.1.3 To facilitate the evaluation of tenured faculty under review, upon request those tenured faculty members under review shall provide to the department chair a current curriculum vita and a description of negotiated faculty roles for distribution to department members.

9.1.4 If during the periodic review the performance of a tenured faculty member is not questioned in writing by a majority of members of the department, the department chairperson will prepare a written review stating that the performance review has been conducted and that a full and complete review is not required.
9.1.5 If during the periodic review, the performance of a tenured faculty member is questioned in writing by a majority of members of the department or unit, or if the appropriate dean, the Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs, or the President questions the faculty member's performance, then the Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs must decide whether a full and complete review must be conducted in accordance with the procedures established for the initial evaluation for tenure at the institution (BSU Policy 4380).


Purpose

An annual department level Tenure Progress Review will be conducted for each non-tenured tenure track faculty member in the College of Education. The purpose of the review is to assist non-tenured faculty members by monitoring their professional progress, and providing advice and guidance. This Tenure Progress Review will be conducted annually by each department’s Promotion and Tenure Committee (or the equivalent), and may include a personal conference with the faculty member.

The faculty member being reviewed should provide the committee with vita materials, department chair’s annual evaluation(s), work in progress, future plans, and any other materials that will assist the review process. These materials should be structured consistent with the guidelines for the Promotion and Tenure Portfolio.

Following the annual department level Tenure Progress Review, the chair of the department committee will prepare a written assessment which will be submitted to the faculty member, with a copy forwarded to the department chair for inclusion in the faculty member’s personnel file. As appropriate, the department chair should assist the faculty member develop and implement professional adjustments.

During the third year of tenure track employment at the university, each non-tenured faculty member will submit a developmental Promotion and Tenure Portfolio to the College of Education Promotion and Tenure Committee. The purpose of this college level Tenure Progress Review by the college committee is to provide each non-tenured faculty member with additional informed judgment about progress toward tenure.

Timeline

March 1 - Each year each non-tenured faculty member will submit a developing promotion and tenure portfolio to the department chair, who will review and then forward the portfolio to the department’s Promotion and Tenure Committee (or equivalent) for review and analysis.

March 15 - The chair of the department Promotion and Tenure Committee (or equivalent) will provide to each non-tenured faculty member a written analysis of the developing promotion and tenure portfolio, including recommendations regarding progress toward promotion and tenure.

March 20 - The department chair will forward the developing promotion and tenure portfolio of each third year non-tenured faculty member to the College of Education Promotion and Tenure Committee.

April 10 - The College of Education Promotion and Tenure Committee will provide to each third year non-tenured faculty member a written analysis of and recommendations regarding progress toward tenure.

April 15 - The chair of the College of Education Promotion and Tenure Committee will forward a copy of that committee analysis to the dean of the College of Education and the appropriate department chair. As appropriate, the chair of the College of Education Promotion and Tenure Committee and/or the dean will meet individually with any third year non-tenured faculty member to discuss strategies to address identified areas of concern.

Reference


Appendix A

Teaching Activity Worksheet

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Teaching Assignment</th>
<th>3rd year Review</th>
<th>Associate Professor/Tenure</th>
<th>Professor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Faculty applying for promotion and tenure should identify activities in the following productivity areas.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Assigned/Jointly Determined Teaching Load</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No. of Preps</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Enrollment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Course Delivery System (i.e., on/off campus, online)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Course/Program Design</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervisor/School Liaison</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate Level Courses</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

UG/G Student Advisor

Advising loads may vary based on department needs.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>UG</th>
<th>Advisor/Supervising/Mentoring</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rename</td>
<td>Masters/Doctorate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chair – Thesis/Projects</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chair – Dissertation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chair – Comprehensive Exam</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Committee Member – Thesis/Projects</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Committee Member – Dissertation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Committee Member – Doctoral Comprehensive Exam</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Committee Member – Master’s Comprehensive Exam</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Other

Faculty may submit other teaching activities as evidence to support or that further reflects upon their academic expertise.

Evaluation

Faculty will submit a summary of evaluations for courses taught during semesters under review.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course Evaluations</th>
<th>Meets Expectations</th>
<th>Meets Expectations</th>
<th>Receive 3 Exceeds Expectations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Peer Evaluation(s)—(Optional)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chair Evaluations</td>
<td>Average Meets Expectations</td>
<td>Minimum 1 Exceeds Expectations</td>
<td>Minimum 3 Exceeds Expectations</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

[1] Expectations are based on assigned workloads of 18 units of teaching (60% effort); 6 units of scholarship (20% effort); and 6 units of service (20%). Faculty workloads adjusted from an 18 unit teaching assignment will result in higher/lower expectations in scholarship/service activities and must be documented in annual faculty evaluations, as well as supported by evidence from the Department Chair.

[2] UG student advising that is associated with a faculty member’s assigned workload shall be counted as service activity.

[3] If necessary, Department Chair should assist faculty to establish a plan for improvement.

Appendix B
Scholarly Activity Worksheet

Numerical criteria are recommendations. Each department and the disciplines represented within departments may require different emphases that better reflect recognized scholarship in those fields.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Publications</th>
<th>3rd Year Review</th>
<th>Associate Professor/Tenure</th>
<th>Professor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Articles, Peer-reviewed</td>
<td>3 recommended</td>
<td>6 recommended</td>
<td>15 recommended</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Articles, Non-peer reviewed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Books – Edited</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Books – Authored</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Book chapter</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monographs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abstracts</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curriculum Development</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Web authoring, multi-media</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research Reports</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conference Proceedings</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Established line of enquiry</td>
<td>Supportive External Review</td>
<td>Recognized as scholar by External Review</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Presentations</th>
<th>3rd Year Review</th>
<th>Associate Professor/Tenure</th>
<th>Professor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Professional Meetings (Peer-reviewed)</td>
<td>2 recommended</td>
<td>4 recommended</td>
<td>9 recommended</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National</td>
<td>1 recommended at this level</td>
<td>2 recommended at this level</td>
<td>6 recommended at this level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Panel member/discussant</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Session/Section Chair</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Invited</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Keynote</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Speeches, Workshops</th>
<th>3rd Year Review</th>
<th>Associate Professor/Tenure</th>
<th>Professor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Non-peer reviewed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National/International</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Invited</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grants</th>
<th>3rd Year Review</th>
<th>Associate Professor/Tenure</th>
<th>Professor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Internal - Funded</td>
<td>Recommended 1</td>
<td>Recommended 1</td>
<td>Recommended 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internal - Not Funded</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>External - Funded</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Recommended 2 submitted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>External - Not Funded</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Other</th>
<th>3rd Year Review</th>
<th>Associate Professor/Tenure</th>
<th>Professor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Faculty may submit other scholarly activities (see Boyer, 1990) as evidence to support or that further reflects academic expertise.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Editorial Boards/Reviewer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regular Journal Column</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Faculty hired with prior experience will have expectations for Promotion and/or Tenure stated clearly in their Letter of Appointment from the Dean.

Expectations are based on assigned workloads of 18 units of teaching (60% effort); 6 units of scholarship (20% effort); and 6 units of service (20%). Faculty workloads adjusted from an 18 unit teaching assignment will result in higher/lower expectations in scholarship/service activities and must be documented in annual faculty evaluations, as well as supported by evidence from the Department Chair.

Although seeking external funding is strongly encouraged, at times, funding is limited in some disciplines. Other scholarly activities can supplant grants submitted for external funding.

### Appendix C

#### Service Activity Worksheet

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Department Committees</th>
<th>3rd Year Review</th>
<th>Tenure/Associate Professor</th>
<th>Professor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chair</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Member</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chair of Department</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assigned Administrative Duties (e.g., Program Director; Student Advisor)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>College Committees</th>
<th>3rd Year Review</th>
<th>Tenure/Associate Professor</th>
<th>Professor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chair</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Member</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assigned Administrative Duties (e.g., Program Director; Student Advisor)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>University Committees</th>
<th>3rd Year Review</th>
<th>Tenure/Associate Professor</th>
<th>Professor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chair</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Member</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assigned Administrative Duties (e.g., Program Director; Student Advisor)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student Service/Organizations</th>
<th>3rd Year Review</th>
<th>Tenure/Associate Professor</th>
<th>Professor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chair</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Member</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assigned Administrative Duties (e.g., Program Director; Student Advisor)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scholarly/Professional Organizations/State Committees or Educational Agencies</th>
<th>3rd Year Review</th>
<th>Tenure/Associate Professor</th>
<th>Professor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Conference hosted (e.g., Role)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conference Activities (e.g., Role)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organization/Committee/Agency (e.g., Role)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International</td>
<td>Community Engagement</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Presentations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Workshops/Seminars</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Consulting</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Service Grants</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Board: Office/Members</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Committee: Officer/Member</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Volunteer Service (not as an official member of board or committee)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>Faculty may submit other service activities as evidence to support or that further reflects their academic expertise.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

[7] Expectations are based on an assigned workload of 18 units of teaching (60% effort); 6 units of scholarship (20% effort); and 6 units of service (20%). Faculty workloads adjusted from an 18 unit teaching assignment will result in higher/lower expectations in scholarship/service activities and must be documented in annual faculty evaluations, as well as supported by evidence from the Department Chair.

Appendix D
Appendix D

College of Education
Eligibility and Summary Recommendations Form
Promotion and/or Tenure

Candidate completes Items 1-3; Candidate and Department Chair complete Item 4

1. Name: ________________________
   (Last) ________________________
   (First) ________________________
   (Middle) ________________________

2. The individual named above is applying for: _______ promotion _______ tenure
   (check either or both)

3. Proposed Rank and Title:
   ________________________
   (e.g., Associate Professor of Elementary Ed.)

   Present Rank and Title: ________________________
   Year Awarded: ________________________

4. Eligibility:
   (See BSU Policy 4340 and 4370: College of Education Promotion and Tenure Policy and Procedures.)
   Yes No Faculty member meets eligibility criteria for Tenure Review
   Yes No Faculty member meets eligibility criteria for Promotion Review

   Candidate Signature ________________________ Date: ________________________
   Department Chair Signature ________________________ Date: ________________________

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recommendations</th>
<th>Department P&amp;T</th>
<th>Department Chair</th>
<th>COE P&amp;T</th>
<th>Dean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Recommendation</td>
<td>Tenure Promotion</td>
<td>Tenure Promotion</td>
<td>Tenure Promotion</td>
<td>Tenure Promotion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes Yes</td>
<td>Yes Yes</td>
<td>Yes No</td>
<td>Yes No</td>
<td>Yes Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No No</td>
<td>No No</td>
<td>No Yes</td>
<td>No Yes</td>
<td>No No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Candidate Notified | Yes No | Yes No | Yes No | Yes No |
Chair Signature |    |        |        |        |
Date |    |        |        |        |
Candidate Signature |    |        |        |        |
Date |    |        |        |        |

Appendix E
Policy and Procedure Manual

College of Education
Promotion & Tenure Materials Checklist and Timeline

September 15—the following materials should be submitted to the Department Chair:

- Eligibility and Summary Recommendation Form (Candidate completes Items 1-3; Candidate and Department Chair complete Item 4)
- Letter of application (statement of role)
- Completed portfolio (see #4 of the Promotion/Tenure Portfolio of the College of Education Promotion and Tenure Policy and Procedures Manual)
- Vita
- Evidence of teaching effectiveness
- Evidence of scholarly activities
- Evidence of service

- Department requirements for Promotion and Tenure which augment the University or College policy have been acknowledged and addressed in this file

September 30—Department Promotion and Tenure review completed and candidate notified of recommendation

October 5—Candidate responds by signing Eligibility and Summary Recommendation Form (attach response to recommendation if desired.)

October 10—Department Chair review completed; candidate notified of recommendation.

October 15—Candidate responds by signing Eligibility and Summary Recommendation Form (attach response to recommendation if desired)

October 15—Department Chair forwards the portfolio and recommendation to the College of Education Promotion and Tenure Committee.

December 1—College of Education Promotion and Tenure Committee review completed; candidate notified of recommendation.

December 6—Candidate responds by signing Eligibility and Summary Recommendation Form (attach response to recommendation if desired.) Candidate appeal due/request meeting with the College of Education Promotion & Tenure Committee, if desired. (See College of Education Promotion & Tenure Appeal procedures (pg. D6, Item 6.2.)

December 15—College of Education Promotion and Tenure Committee forwards portfolio and recommendation to the Dean.

January 15—College of Education Dean notifies each candidate of recommendation to be forwarded to the Provost and Academic Vice-President.

January 20—Candidate responds by signing Eligibility and Summary Recommendation Form (attach response to recommendation if desired.) Candidate appeal due/request meeting with the Dean, if desired (see College of Education Promotion & Tenure Appeal procedures (pg. D6, Item 6.2.)

January 31—Dean forwards all promotion and tenure recommendations to the Provost and Academic Vice-President.

April 15 (or within 15 days after the State Board of Education meeting)—President informs candidates of the action of the Board.

PROMOTION AND TENURE POLICY AND PROCEDURES

Temporary Addendum
(Effective until May 2011)

The P & T Task Force recommends that a grace period of three years (until May 2011) be extended to associate professors for the purpose of promotion to the rank of professor under the Promotion and Tenure policy that was in place upon hire. This grace period would afford faculty members the opportunity to work towards the new Promotion and Tenure policy, and at the same time, would allow them to be held accountable to
the scholarly activity requirements in place when they were hired. At the end of the three year grace period all associate professors would be promoted under the new policy.

TENURE PROGRESS REVIEW POLICY
College of Education
Approved by faculty vote 5/2/2008

Purpose

An annual department level Tenure Progress Review will be conducted for each non-tenured tenure track faculty member in the College of Education. The purpose of the review is to assist non-tenured faculty members by monitoring their professional progress, and providing advice and guidance. This Tenure Progress Review will be conducted annually by each department’s Promotion and Tenure Committee (or the equivalent), and may include a personal conference with the faculty member.

The faculty member being reviewed should provide the committee with vita materials, department chair’s annual evaluation(s), work in progress, future plans, and any other materials that will assist the review process. These materials should be structured consistent with the guidelines for the Promotion and Tenure Portfolio.

Following the annual department level Tenure Progress Review, the chair of the department committee will prepare a written assessment which will be submitted to the faculty member, with a copy forwarded to the department chair for inclusion in the faculty member’s personnel file. As appropriate, the department chair should assist the faculty member develop and implement professional adjustments.

During the third year of tenure track employment at the university, each non-tenured faculty member will submit a developmental Promotion and Tenure Portfolio to the College of Education Promotion and Tenure Committee. The purpose of this college level Tenure Progress Review by the college committee is to provide each non-tenured faculty member with additional informed judgment about progress toward tenure.

Timelines

March 1 - Each year each non-tenured faculty member will submit a developing promotion and tenure portfolio to the department chair, who will review and then forward the portfolio to the department’s Promotion and Tenure Committee (or equivalent) for review and analysis.

March 15 - The chair of the department Promotion and Tenure Committee (or equivalent) will provide to each non-tenured faculty member a written analysis of the developing promotion and tenure portfolio, including recommendations regarding progress toward promotion and tenure.

March 20 - The department chair will forward the developing promotion and tenure portfolio of each third year non-tenured faculty member to the College of Education Promotion and Tenure Committee.

April 10 - The College of Education Promotion and Tenure Committee will provide to each third year non-tenured faculty member a written analysis of and recommendations regarding progress toward tenure.

April 15 - The chair of the College of Education Promotion and Tenure Committee will forward a copy of that committee analysis to the dean of the College of Education and the appropriate department chair. As appropriate, the chair of the College of Education Promotion and Tenure Committee and/or the dean will meet individually with any third year non-tenured faculty member to discuss strategies to address identified areas of concern.

Faculty Salary Guidelines

FACULTY SALARY GUIDELINES
Approved 4/21/06

The intent of this policy is to provide guidelines for the distribution of discretionary faculty salary funds, the notification of faculty, and appeals regarding faculty salary decisions.

1. Money associated with promotions and across the board increases is automatically added to faculty salaries by the Budget Office and requires no action by College of Education personnel.
2. If discretionary funds are provided for performance and/or salary equity and the percentages for distribution are not specified by the President or Provost, the College of Education Salary Equity Committee shall make a recommendation to the Dean regarding the percentage distribution for each category.

3. Total salary equity within the College shall be reviewed annually by the Salary Equity Committee to evaluate whether there is an equitable distribution of salaries within the college. Following this evaluation, the College of Education Salary Equity Committee shall make recommendations to the Dean regarding the process and criteria for distributing salary equity funds. As a minimum, the Salary Equity Committee shall consider the following factors when evaluating the status of salary equity in the College of Education:
   - years of higher education experience
   - years of public school and/or relevant full-time experience
   - years in rank
   - performance over time
   - current performance in teaching, scholarship and service
   - market averages for each rank and discipline

4. The Dean shall consider, but is not bound by the recommendations of the Salary Equity Committee. The Dean shall allocate funds for performance to departments using percentage of salary base as a guideline, unless data indicates a difference in performance levels among departments that warrants adjustments to that distribution. The Dean shall distribute equity funds based on the number and degree of perceived inequities within each department. The Dean will withhold up to .25% of the total salaries in the college to address potential appeals.

5. Department chairs shall determine the performance and equity adjustments awarded each member of their faculty. Performance increments shall be determined by dividing the money available by the total of faculty performance ratings in each unit. Increments of distinct and equal dollar amounts shall be distributed across the performance ratings established in the College of Education Faculty Evaluation Guidelines. Chairs shall consider, but are not bound by the Salary Equity Committee’s recommendations for distributing salary equity funds.

6. Notification. After determining salary adjustments for faculty in the unit, the Department Chair shall notify each faculty member of the recommended adjustments for performance and equity. Following resolution of any appeals (see section 7) the chair forwards to the Dean in writing a salary recommendation for each faculty member.

7. Appeals. If a faculty member does not agree with the proposed adjustment, he or she may appeal to the Department Chair within two working days of receipt of the proposed adjustment. If the faculty member disagrees with the Chair’s decision regarding the appeal, he or she can appeal to the Dean within two working days from notification of the Chair’s decision on the appeal. The Dean shall notify the faculty member in writing of his or her recommendation and direct the essential information to the Provost. Faculty are reminded that after exhausting the College of Education process, they have recourse to the Faculty Grievance Procedure as described in BSU Policy 5375-B. Funds not utilized to address appeals will be distributed to departments to supplement awarded increases.

8. Any guidelines established annually by the President or Provost, the State Board of Education, or the Legislature will have precedence over provisions of this policy.

**ACCREDITATION AND AFFILIATION WITH NATIONAL ORGANIZATIONS**

A number of College of Education programs are affiliated with and accredited by national organizations including:

- **National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE).** National accreditation of college and university programs for the preparation of all teachers and other professional school personnel at the elementary and secondary levels is the sole responsibility of the National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE). NCATE is recognized by the Council on Postsecondary Accreditation as having authority to adopt standards and procedures for accreditation and to determine the accreditation status of institutional programs for preparing teacher and other professional school personnel. NCATE is also designated by the United States Secretary of Education as the only nationally-recognized accrediting agency in the field of education.

- **The American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education (AACTE).** The American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education is a national, voluntary organization of colleges and universities that prepare the nation’s teachers and other education personnel. AACTE and its predecessor organizations represent more than a century of professional service that encompasses the movement of collegiate-based teacher, counselor, and administrator training from normal schools to comprehensive universities. Member institutions include small liberal arts colleges, state universities, and large research institutions. Combined, they graduate more than four-fifths of new school personnel each year. With a network of more than 700 nationally or regionally accredited member institutions and 44 state affiliates, AACTE is the recognized representatives of teacher education interests before Congress, state legislatures, media, and other organizations. The College of Education at BSU also holds membership in the Idaho affiliate of AACTE, the Idaho Association of Colleges for Teacher Education (IACTE).
• **The Teacher Education Council of State Colleges and Universities (TECSCU).** The Teacher Education Council of State Colleges and Universities is a national association of schools/colleges/departments of education in institutions which are members of the American Association of State Colleges and Universities and the American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education. TECSCU institutions comprise the largest component of teacher education in the United States and are concerned with the problems, possibilities, and interests of these units. It serves as a forum for the interchange of ideas and information among its members and as a representative of teacher education at a national policy-making level.

• **National Association of State Directors of Teacher Education and Certification (NASDTEC).** Teacher Education programs at BSU are certified at the state level through the State of Idaho Professional Standards Committee, using the eight (8) NASDTEC Standards as a guide. Through NASDTEC the state has a working agreement with NCATE regarding the preparation of materials and the scheduling of accreditation visits.

• **Interstate New Teacher Assessment and Support Consortium (INTASC).** Since NASDTEC standards have not been updated, the State of Idaho has adopted standards using guidelines developed by the Interstate New Teacher Assessment and Support Consortium (INTASC).

• The Counselor Education Department is accredited by the **Commission on the Accreditation of Counselor and Related Education Programs (CACREP).**

• The BSU Athletic Training Program is accredited by the **Commission on Accreditation of Allied Health Education Programs (CAAHEP),** which is the national governing body for the profession of Athletic Training within the United States.
PROMOTION AND TENURE
POLICY AND PROCEDURES
College of Education

Revised by COE Faculty 5-1-11; approved 5-2-2008

Purpose

This policy is designed to systematize the College of Education’s promotion and tenure procedures, and supplements the College of Education Faculty Evaluation Guidelines policy. These promotion and tenure guidelines interpret and clarify university policies for promotion (BSU 4340-II.B) and tenure (BSU 4370) specific to the role and mission of the College of Education.

Preamble

Tenure and promotion in the College of Education is the natural consequence of faculty members contributing productive and valued work for the good of the university, profession, and community. Faculty members are held to high standards in teaching, scholarly activity and service. The three areas are connected in integral ways by a broad, encompassing vision of the nature of intellectual work. The scholar is one who steps back from his/her investigations, looks for connections, builds bridges between theory and practice, and communicates his/her knowledge effectively to students and to the larger community. Knowledge may be acquired through research, through synthesis, through practice, and through teaching (Boyer, 1990).

When a faculty member seeks promotion and/or tenure, college administrators and the College of Education Promotion and Tenure Committee should consider the complexity of programs in the college, differentiated teaching loads, limited resources, and the diversity of interests and abilities among the faculty members in reaching recommendations concerning that candidate. Faculty members should build on their strengths as they develop professional agendas. The recommendations of college administrators and the college’s Promotion and Tenure Committee on candidates should acknowledge both the candidate’s personal talents as well as the needs of the university, profession, and community.

The following guidelines describe a process that, when fairly and consistently administered, holds faculty members accountable and rewards them for their professional contributions.

1. Purposes of the College of Education Promotion and Tenure Committee

1.1 To represent the interests of the faculty of the college in promotion and tenure recommendations.

1.2 To review faculty applications for promotion and tenure and make subsequent recommendations to the dean of the college.
1.3 To facilitate fairness, equity and consistency across the college in promotion and tenure decisions.

1.4 To review each non-tenured faculty member during the third year of full employment at the university, and provide the faculty member with informed judgment and guidance concerning progress toward tenure.

1.5 To conduct a thorough review of this policy every five years (or as needed).

2. Structure and Procedures of the College of Education Promotion and Tenure Committee

2.1 By September 15 of each year, each department shall elect from its ranks potential members for the College of Education Promotion and Tenure Committee. Whenever possible, departments shall seek potential committee members who represent each of three categories: (a) faculty members who are non-tenured from those departments that have no candidates for promotion and tenure, (b) faculty members who are tenured, and (c) faculty members holding the rank of Professor. The names of these department nominees are submitted to the dean, who will then appoint a College of Education Promotion and Tenure Committee from the names submitted no later than October 1.

2.2 The final composition of the committee shall consist of one (1) faculty member from each department and one (1) student (see Section 2.4). The committee must include one (1) tenured member from each candidate’s department, one (1) non-tenured member, and one (1) student representative. At least two (2) members must hold the rank of Professor. Each member of the committee has one (1) equal vote on all matters.

After the official college committee has been appointed and before the first meeting convened by the dean, each department chair may nominate to the Dean one (1) non-tenured faculty member to serve in an ex-officio capacity to the COE P&T committee. Ex-officio members are not voting members and are bound by the rules of confidentiality.

2.3 Tenured faculty members shall serve staggered two (2) year terms. To maintain continuity within the committee, each year at least two (2) tenured members of the committee shall be serving their second year. Non-tenured faculty members shall serve one (1) year terms. No faculty member shall serve consecutive terms.

2.4 The dean should request the name of a student representative for the college committee from the Associated Students of Boise State University. This student member will serve a one (1) year term.

2.5 The dean should convene the first meeting of the committee and define its charge.

2.6 The College of Education Promotion and Tenure Committee should base its recommendation about a candidate on a variety of sources of information. These should include the following.
2.6.1 The candidate’s Promotion and Tenure Portfolio (as described below).

2.6.2 The written report of the department Promotion and Tenure Committee (or its equivalent). (This department level report is to be submitted directly to the College of Education Promotion and Tenure Committee and added to the candidate’s portfolio.)

2.6.3 The written recommendation for tenure and/or promotion from the department chair. (This department level report is to be submitted directly to the College Promotion and Tenure Committee and added to the portfolio).

2.6.4 The external review results.

2.7 No additional materials may be added to a candidate’s portfolio without the consent of the candidate.

2.8 All votes of the College of Education Promotion and Tenure Committee shall be by secret ballot. The specific vote count will be recorded by the committee chair, and supplemented by a written rationale for the committee’s recommendation.

2.9 The College of Education Promotion and Tenure Committee will prepare and submit a letter to the dean noting the committee vote and rationale. This letter will accompany the candidate’s portfolio to the dean.

3. Criteria for Recommendations

3.1 The recommendations of the College of Education Promotion and Tenure Committee must be based on the professional judgment of the committee members regarding the significance and achievement of the candidate’s contributions in teaching, scholarly activity, and service. To be recommended for tenure and/or to be promoted, each faculty member is expected to demonstrate contributions of substance in each area. Contributions in each area are shaped by both the needs of the institution and the talents and interests of the faculty member. Therefore, the tenure and/or promotion recommendations of the committee should incorporate consideration of the annual role(s) that the individual has negotiated and/or been assigned within the department, the college, and the institution. To this end, candidates should provide documentation of annually negotiated departmental roles for the time under review in the Promotion and Tenure portfolio. (see College of Education Work Load Policy).

3.2 Tenure. The outcomes of tenure decisions substantially impact the long term quality of the college and university. Tenure recommendations are based on both the candidate’s past performance in teaching, scholarly activity, and service, as well as on an assessment of the candidate’s potential for continued excellence and contribution in these areas. Successful candidates for tenure will provide evidence of an established record of success as an excellent teacher, an ongoing agenda of
scholarly activity, and a commitment to productive service to the university, the profession, and the community.

It is anticipated that for faculty members at the rank of Assistant Professor, tenure and promotion to Associate Professor typically would occur simultaneously.

3.2.1 Criteria for tenure.

3.2.1.1 Earned doctorate (nationally recognized excellence in the field may be substituted for the terminal degree).

3.2.1.2 Sustained effectiveness and a continuing commitment to teaching (see Appendix A, Teaching Activity Worksheet).

3.2.1.3 A record of scholarly activity, including peer-reviewed publications (see Appendix B, Scholarly Activity Worksheet).

3.2.1.4 A record of service contributions, both locally and nationally (see Appendix C, Service Activity Worksheet).

3.2.1.5 Five years of full-time experience in an academic rank at an institution of higher learning. Faculty members become eligible to apply for tenure during the fifth year of service on the Official Faculty. A faculty member who is given credit for prior service at the time of initial employment may be considered for tenure no earlier than during his or her third full year of employment at Boise State University except under extraordinary circumstance.

3.3 Promotion. Successful candidates for promotion must demonstrate excellence in teaching, scholarly activity, and service.

3.3.1 Criteria for the rank of Assistant Professor (BSU Policy 4340).

3.3.2 Criteria for Promotion to Associate Professor

3.3.2.1 Earned doctorate (nationally recognized excellence in the field may be substituted for the terminal degree).

3.3.2.2 Sustained effectiveness and a continuing commitment to teaching (see Appendix A, Teaching Activity Worksheet).

3.3.2.3 A record of scholarly activity, including peer-reviewed journals (see Appendix B, Scholarly Activity Worksheet).

3.3.2.4 A record of service contributions, both locally and nationally (see Appendix C, Service Activity Worksheet).
3.3.2.5 Five years of full-time experience at an accredited institution of higher education but no earlier than during his or her third full year of employment at Boise State University except under extraordinary circumstance.

3.3.3 Criteria for promotion to Professor. University guidelines emphasize that promotion to Professor should be reserved for individuals who are “truly and demonstrably outstanding among their peers” and who have “achieved additional distinction clearly above that of an Associate Professor” (BSU Policy 4340-II.C). In the College of Education, promotion to Professor recognizes individuals who have made substantive contributions to their fields through consistently excellent teaching, a sustained agenda of prominent scholarly activity, and productive service of high visibility and significance.

3.3.3.1 Earned doctorate (nationally recognized excellence in the field may be substituted for the terminal degree).

3.3.3.2 Sustained effectiveness and a continuing commitment to teaching (see Appendix A, Teaching Activity Worksheet).

3.3.3.3 Scholarly activities that result in significant contributions to their field (see Appendix B, Scholarly Activity Worksheet).

3.3.3.4 Significant service to the profession, both locally and nationally, related to professional interests and expertise (see Appendix C, Service Activity Worksheet).

3.3.3.5 Eight years of full-time experience in an academic rank at an accredited institution but no earlier than during his or her third full year of employment at Boise State University except under extraordinary circumstance.

4. External Reviews

4.1 All candidates for tenure and/or promotion to Associate Professor or Professor will participate in an external review as follows.

4.2 The candidate’s department will obtain a minimum of two and a maximum of five external letters of evaluation from a list of impartial experts who are held with respect in academe, and are either recently or at present working in the candidate’s field at other universities (or the equivalent).

4.3 This list of potential external reviewers will specifically exclude (a) former and current co-workers, (b) co-authors, (c) major academic professors and/or advisors, (d) individuals who had/have financial or contractual obligations with the candidate,
and/or (e) other persons with whom the candidate has or has had an established working or personal relationship.

4.4 Candidates may submit qualifications of outside reviewers and suggest names of potential external reviewers to the department. However, the department chair, or a tenured department member designated by the chair, will ultimately solicit the external reviewers.

4.5 The names of the external reviewers will be identified only to members of the department and college Promotion and Tenure Committees, the dean, and the provost.

4.6 Each external evaluator should be tenured and at the rank of Associate Professor or Professor (or the equivalent) at his/her institution.

4.7 The department will send to at least three external reviewers a letter requesting external review of the candidate for tenure and/or promotion. This letter should provide the following information.

4.7.1 An introductory statement about the candidate and the tenure and/or promotion process at Boise State, and a request for the external reviewer to participate in the candidate’s tenure and/or promotion process.

4.7.2 A statement about who is not eligible to serve as a reviewer: (a) former and current co-workers, (b) co-authors, (c) major academic professors and/or advisors, (d) individuals who had/have financial or contractual obligations with the candidate, and/or (e) other persons with whom the candidate has or has had an established working or personal relationship.

4.7.3 A statement to indicate that all letters from external reviewers will be treated as confidential.

4.7.4 The requested deadline for receipt of the letter from the external reviewer.

4.7.5 A copy of the candidate’s letter of application for tenure and/or promotion from the Promotion and Tenure portfolio.

4.7.6 A copy of the candidate’s vita and other pertinent information from the candidate’s file (e.g., reprints, articles).

4.7.7 A request that the external reviewer (a) note the nature of his/her acquaintance with the candidate, (b) comment on the candidate’s recognition or standing among her/his peers, and (c) provide detailed assessments of the significance and contribution to the profession of the candidate’s scholarly activity and professional contributions within the context of the candidate’s defined workload obligations in the areas of teaching, scholarly activity, and service.
4.7.8 A request that the external reviewer submit a copy of his/her vita along with the review.

4.8 Upon request, an external reviewer may be provided with a copy of any materials in the candidate’s Promotion and Tenure Portfolio vita, as well as any other supporting materials.

4.9 The department chair, or a tenured department member designated by the chair, is to insert the following documents into the candidate’s portfolio binder: (a) two to five letters from external reviewers, (b) each reviewer’s current vita, (c) the department’s letter sent to the reviewers requesting the review (as detailed in Section 4.7), and (d) a detailed description of the procedure used to solicit the candidate’s reviewers. These documents will be included in the candidate’s Promotion and Tenure Portfolio until the review process is complete, at which time they will be removed from the portfolio before it is returned to the candidate. These external letters of review are to be incorporated in the evaluation of the candidate by the department Promotion and Tenure Committee, the department chair, the College of Education Promotion and Tenure Committee, and the dean of the college.

5. The Promotion and Tenure Portfolio

5.1 The basic structure of the Promotion and Tenure Portfolio should include the following sections.

5.1.1 College of Education Eligibility and Summary Recommendations Form.

5.1.2 Letter of Request. This letter (two page maximum) shall note the specific nature of the candidate’s request (tenure, promotion, rank). The letter should also highlight the applicant’s productivity and major contributions in Teaching, Scholarly Activity and Service. Each of these three areas should be clearly identified and addressed within this Letter of Request.

5.1.3 The Promotion and Tenure Vita (see Section 6).

5.1.4 The annual statements of the role(s) that the faculty member has negotiated and/or been assigned within the department, college, and the institution.

5.1.5 All annual department chair evaluations, along with all annual Tenure Progress Review evaluations from the department Promotion and Tenure Committee, and the three year Tenure Progress Review from the college Promotion and Tenure Committee.
5.1.6 Evidence of teaching effectiveness. In this section of the Promotion and Tenure Portfolio the candidate should include evidence of effectiveness in Teaching. The Teaching section of the Promotion and Tenure Portfolio should include the following information.

5.1.6.1 A listing of all courses taught within the last three years, including the student enrollment in and credit hours of each.

5.1.6.2 The complete statistical analyses of all courses taught within the last three years.

5.1.6.3 At least two complete sets of course evaluation student narrative comments from classes within the past academic year.

5.1.6.4 Additional documentation of teaching effectiveness.

5.1.6.5 A 1-2 page narrative introduction, written by the candidate, to “teaching effectiveness,” placed at the beginning of Section 5.1.6. Possible topics for the introduction might include the candidate’s philosophy of teaching, reflections on teaching at Boise State, innovating in the classroom, curriculum development, relationship with partner schools, etc. This introduction is also to include a detailed description of any teaching activity associated with a negotiated workload different from a 60% allocation for teaching.

5.1.7 Evidence of scholarly activity. In this section of the portfolio the candidate should include a summary compilation of all scholarly contributions to date in reverse chronological order, prepared in APA format. Representative hard copy samples of publications should accompany the Promotion and Tenure Portfolio in a separate binder. The Scholarly Activity section of the Promotion and Tenure Portfolio should be organized as follows.

5.1.7.1 Publications.

5.1.7.1.1 Journals: refereed.

5.1.7.1.1.1 National and international.
5.1.7.1.1.2 Regional and local.
5.1.7.1.1.3 Invited.

5.1.7.1.2 Journals: non-refereed.
5.1.7.1.2.1 National and international.
5.1.7.1.2.2 Regional and local.
5.1.7.1.2.3 Invited.

5.1.7.1.3 Books.
5.1.7.1.3.1 Authored.
5.1.7.1.3.2 Edited.
5.1.7.1.3.3 Chapters.

5.1.7.1.4 Other publications.

5.1.7.2 Scholarly presentations.
5.1.7.2.1 National and international.
5.1.7.2.2 Regional, state or local.
5.1.7.2.3 Invited.
5.1.7.2.4 Other scholarly presentations.

5.1.7.3 Grants.
5.1.7.3.1 Funded.
5.1.7.2.2 Not funded.

5.1.7.4 Other scholarly activity.

5.1.7.5 A 1-2 page narrative introduction, written by the candidate, to “scholarly activity,” placed at the beginning of Section 5.1.7. Possible topics for the introduction might include the candidate’s area(s) of scholarly focus and nature of research, reflections on scholarly activities, determination of first authorship in collaborative publications, nature of collaborative authorship (including writing responsibilities when candidate is not first author), the quality of publications (such as acceptance rates, impact factors, and/or circulation rates for journals), justification of interpreting a specific non-refereed journal as “equivalent” in value to a peer-reviewed journal, etc. This introduction is also to include a detailed description of any scholarly activity associated with a negotiated workload different from a 20% allocation for research.

5.1.8 Evidence of service contributions. In this section of the portfolio the candidate should include a compilation of all service contributions to date in reverse chronological order. The Service section of the Promotion and Tenure Portfolio should be organized as follows.
5.1.8.1 Service to the university.

5.1.8.1.1 University service (noting committees chaired, committee memberships, and committee outcomes).

5.1.8.1.2 College service (noting committees chaired, committee memberships, and committee outcomes).

5.1.8.1.3 Department service (noting committees chaired, committee memberships, and committee outcomes).

5.1.8.2 Service to the profession.

5.1.8.2.1 National and international.

5.1.8.2.2 Regional and state.

5.1.8.2.3 Local.

5.1.8.3 Service to the community (professionally relevant).

5.1.8.4 A 1-2 page narrative introduction, written by the candidate, to “service contributions,” placed at the beginning of Section 5.1.8. Possible topics for the introduction might include the candidate’s philosophy of service, reflections on service contributions, developing key service activities, etc. This introduction is also to include a detailed description of any service activity associated with a negotiated workload different from a 20% allocation for service.

5.2 Additional supporting documentation may be included in the Promotion and Tenure Portfolio at the discretion of the candidate. Candidates should be judicious in including additional documentation, as voluminous materials may inadvertently obfuscate other documentation materials of greater significance.

6. The Promotion and Tenure Portfolio Vita. Candidates for tenure and/or promotion should include in the portfolio a vita standardized for this purpose. This Promotion and Tenure Vita serves as an overview of the complete Promotion and Tenure Portfolio.

6.1 The Promotion and Tenure Vita should include the following components.

6.1.1 Demographic information (name, professional address, contact information, etc.).

6.1.2 Current and former professional positions and ranks, in reverse chronological order.
6.1.3 Teaching assignments. This should include in reverse chronological a semester-by-semester listing of all courses taught over the previous three years, including (a) the student enrollment in each and (b) the “overall” instructor statistical summary evaluation for each course.

6.1.4 Scholarly activity. This should include a reverse chronological listing of scholarly achievements.

6.1.5 Service. This section should be organized in reverse chronological order, and by type of service (university, profession, community).

6.2 Each candidate is to submit a secured and un-editable electronic copy (e.g., a .pdf file) of the P&T Vita to the department chair.

7. The Promotion and Tenure Recommendation Process and Timelines in the College of Education

7.1 By September 1, each candidate for promotion and/or tenure will submit to the department Promotion and Tenure Committee the names of at least five impartial external reviewers from the same or related discipline as the candidate.

7.2 By September 15 each candidate will submit the Promotion and Tenure Portfolio to the department chair, or a tenured department member designated by the chair, who will then forward the materials to the department Promotion and Tenure Committee. Each candidate is also to submit a secured and un-editable electronic copy of the Promotion and Tenure Portfolio Vita to the department chair.

7.3 By October 1 the department Promotion and Tenure Committee shall review each candidate’s portfolio, provide a written recommendation to the department chair and to the College of Education Promotion and Tenure Committee, and in writing notify each candidate of the committee’s decision, accompanied by a rationale for this decision. The specific vote count of the department committee for each candidate will be recorded and reported to the department chair and to the College of Education Promotion and Tenure Committee. These written documents will be included in each candidate’s portfolio. The candidate will acknowledge the committee recommendation by signing the Eligibility and Summary Recommendations Form. The candidate may attach a response to the committee’s recommendation if desired.

7.4 By October 15 the department chair will review the portfolio and the recommendation of the department committee for each candidate, provide a written recommendation to the College Promotion and Tenure Committee, including a rationale for that recommendation, and provide each candidate with the written recommendation. The candidate will acknowledge the chair’s recommendation by signing the Eligibility and Summary Recommendations Form. The candidate may attach a response if desired.
7.5 By December 1 the College Promotion and Tenure Committee will review the portfolio and the recommendations from (a) the department Promotion and Tenure Committee and (b) the department chair for each candidate, and will notify each candidate in writing of the committee’s recommendation, including a rationale for that recommendation. The committee will provide a written recommendation for each candidate to the dean, accompanied by a rationale for that recommendation. The specific college committee vote count on each candidate will be recorded and reported to the dean.

7.6 By December 15 the College of Education Promotion and Tenure Committee will forward all promotion and tenure materials to the dean of the college.

7.7 By January 15 the dean of the college will review each candidate’s portfolio and all recommendations, and make a recommendation to the Provost and Vice-President for Academic Affairs. The dean will notify each candidate in writing of this recommendation, including specific areas of strength and weakness.

7.8 If a mandatory tenure decision is not required, a candidate may withdraw an application for promotion and/or tenure at any stage of the promotion and/or tenure process. However, faculty members are required to seek tenure no later than their sixth year of service at Boise State University. If continuous appointment is not awarded by that time the University has the option to issue a terminal contract.

8. Appeals of Recommendations

8.1 Recommendation of the College Promotion and Tenure Committee. If the college committee’s recommendation is that tenure and/or promotion should be denied, within five days of the notification the candidate may request a meeting with the committee. If requested, the committee must schedule a meeting within five working days of the request. The candidate must base any appeal on the established criteria for promotion or tenure. The candidate may present additional evidence. Following the meeting with the candidate, the committee may decide to revote on the recommendation for that candidate. Only committee members who are present at this appeal meeting may participate in any committee decision to revote. This vote requires a quorum of the committee to be in attendance.

8.2 Recommendation of the Dean. If the dean’s recommendation is that tenure and/or promotion should be denied, within five days of the notification the candidate may request a meeting with the dean. The dean must schedule the meeting within five working days of receiving the request. The candidate must base any appeal on the established criteria for promotion or tenure. The candidate may present additional evidence.

9. Tenure Status Review for Tenured Faculty.
9.1 Every five years each tenured faculty member will be reviewed.

9.1.2 Each year the Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs notifies departmental administrators, in writing, as to the members of their units whose performance is to be reviewed during the year and as to the dates by which review procedures are to be completed. Each administrator communicates the names of these individuals to the unit’s faculty members and asks each faculty member to indicate whether the performance of the faculty member who is under review should be questioned (BSU Policy 4380).

9.1.3 To facilitate the evaluation of tenured faculty under review, upon request those tenured faculty members under review shall provide to the department chair a current curriculum vita and a description of negotiated faculty roles for distribution to department members.

9.1.4 If during the periodic review the performance of a tenured faculty member is not questioned in writing by a majority of members of the department, the department chairperson will prepare a written review stating that the performance review has been conducted and that a full and complete review is not required.

9.1.5 If during the periodic review, the performance of a tenured faculty member is questioned in writing by a majority of members of the department or unit, or if the appropriate dean, the Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs, or the President questions the faculty member's performance, then the Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs must decide whether a full and complete review must be conducted in accordance with the procedures established for the initial evaluation for tenure at the institution (BSU Policy 4380).


Purpose

An annual department level Tenure Progress Review will be conducted for each non-tenured tenure track faculty member in the College of Education. The purpose of the review is to assist non-tenured faculty members by monitoring their professional progress, and providing advice and guidance. This Tenure Progress Review will be conducted annually by each department’s Promotion and Tenure Committee (or the equivalent), and may include a personal conference with the faculty member.

The faculty member being reviewed should provide the committee with vita materials, department chair’s annual evaluation(s), work in progress, future plans, and any other materials that will assist the review process. These materials should be structured consistent with the guidelines for the Promotion and Tenure Portfolio.
Following the annual department level Tenure Progress Review, the chair of the department committee will prepare a written assessment which will be submitted to the faculty member, with a copy forwarded to the department chair for inclusion in the faculty member’s personnel file. As appropriate, the department chair should assist the faculty member develop and implement professional adjustments.

During the third year of tenure track employment at the university, each non-tenured faculty member will submit a developmental Promotion and Tenure Portfolio to the College of Education Promotion and Tenure Committee. The purpose of this college level Tenure Progress Review by the college committee is to provide each non-tenured faculty member with additional informed judgment about progress toward tenure.

**Timeline**

March 1 - Each year each non-tenured faculty member will submit a developing promotion and tenure portfolio to the department chair, who will review and then forward the portfolio to the department’s Promotion and Tenure Committee (or equivalent) for review and analysis.

March 15 - The chair of the department Promotion and Tenure Committee (or equivalent) will provide to each non-tenured faculty member a written analysis of the developing promotion and tenure portfolio, including recommendations regarding progress toward promotion and tenure.

March 20 - The department chair will forward the developing promotion and tenure portfolio of each third year non-tenured faculty member to the College of Education Promotion and Tenure Committee.

April 10 - The College of Education Promotion and Tenure Committee will provide to each third year non-tenured faculty member a written analysis of and recommendations regarding progress toward tenure.

April 15 - The chair of the College of Education Promotion and Tenure Committee will forward a copy of that committee analysis to the dean of the College of Education and the appropriate department chair. As appropriate, the chair of the College of Education Promotion and Tenure Committee and/or the dean will meet individually with any third year non-tenured faculty member to discuss strategies to address identified areas of concern.

**Reference**

## Appendix A

### Teaching Activity Worksheet

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Teaching Assignment</th>
<th>3rd year Review</th>
<th>Associate Professor/Tenure</th>
<th>Professor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Faculty applying for promotion and tenure should identify activities in the following productivity areas.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assigned/Jointly Determined Teaching Load</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. of Preps</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Enrollment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Course Delivery System (i.e., on/off campus, online)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Course/Program Design</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervisor/School Liaison</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate Level Courses</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UG/G Student Advisor</td>
<td>Advising loads may vary based on department needs.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UG Advisor/Supervising/Mentoring</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate Student Advisor—Masters/Doctorate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chair – Thesis/Projects</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chair – Dissertation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chair – Comprehensive Exam</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Committee Member – Thesis/Projects</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Committee Member – Dissertation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Committee Member – Doctoral Comprehensive Exam</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Committee Member – Master’s Comprehensive Exam</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>Faculty may submit other teaching activities as evidence to support or that further reflects upon their academic expertise.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Evaluations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course Evaluations</th>
<th>Meets Expectations</th>
<th>Meets Expectations</th>
<th>Receive 3 Exceeds Expectations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Peer Evaluation(s)—(Optional)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chair Evaluations</td>
<td>Average Meets Expectations</td>
<td>Minimum 1 Exceeds Expectations</td>
<td>Minimum 3 Exceeds Expectations</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

1. Expectations are based on assigned workloads of 18 units of teaching (60% effort); 6 units of scholarship (20% effort); and 6 units of service (20%). Faculty workloads adjusted from an 18 unit teaching assignment will result in higher/lower expectations in scholarship/service activities and must be documented in annual faculty evaluations, as well as supported by evidence from the Department Chair.

2. UG student advising that is associated with a faculty member’s assigned workload shall be counted as service activity.

3. If necessary, Department Chair should assist faculty to establish a plan for improvement.
Appendix B
Scholarly Activity Worksheet

Numerical criteria are recommendations. Each department and the disciplines represented within departments may require different emphases that better reflect recognized scholarship in those fields.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>3rd Year Review</th>
<th>Associate Professor/Tenure</th>
<th>Professor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Publications 2</td>
<td>3 recommended</td>
<td>6 recommended</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Articles, Peer-reviewed</td>
<td>2 recommended</td>
<td>4 recommended</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Articles, Non-peer reviewed</td>
<td>Recommended 1 first author</td>
<td>Recommended 2 first author</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Books – Edited</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Books – Authored</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Book chapter</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monographs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abstracts</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curriculum Development</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Web authoring, multi-media</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research Reports</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conference Proceedings</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Established line of enquiry</td>
<td></td>
<td>Supportive External Review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Presentations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional Meetings (Peer-reviewed)</td>
<td>3 recommended</td>
<td>6 recommended</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local</td>
<td>2 recommended</td>
<td>4 recommended</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional</td>
<td>1 recommended at this level</td>
<td>2 recommended at this level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Panel member/discussant</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Session/Section Chair</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Invited</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Keynote</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speeches, Workshops</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-peer reviewed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National/International</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Invited</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grants 6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recommended 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recommended 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recommended 3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internal - Funded</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internal - Not Funded</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>External - Funded</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>External - Not Funded</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty may submit other scholarly activities (see Boyer, 1990) as evidence to support or that further reflects academic expertise.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Editorial Boards/Reviewer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regular Journal Column</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4 Faculty hired with prior experience will have expectations for Promotion and/or Tenure stated clearly in their Letter of Appointment from the Dean.
5 Expectations are based on assigned workloads of 18 units of teaching (60% effort); 6 units of scholarship (20% effort); and 6 units of service (20%). Faculty workloads adjusted from an 18 unit teaching assignment will result in higher/lower expectations in scholarship/service activities and must be documented in annual faculty evaluations, as well as supported by evidence from the Department Chair.
6 Although seeking external funding is strongly encouraged, at times, funding is limited in some disciplines. Other scholarly activities can supplant grants submitted for external funding.
Appendix C
Service Activity Worksheet

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Department Committees</th>
<th>3rd Year Review</th>
<th>Tenure/Associate Professor</th>
<th>Professor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chair</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Member</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chair of Department</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assigned Administrative Duties (e.g., Program Director; Student Advisor)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| College Committees     |                |                             |           |
| Chair                  |                |                             |           |
| Member                 |                |                             |           |
| Assigned Administrative Duties (e.g., Program Director; Student Advisor) | | | |

| University Committees  |                |                             |           |
| Chair                  |                |                             |           |
| Member                 |                |                             |           |
| Assigned Administrative Duties (e.g., Program Director; Student Advisor) | | | |

| Student Service/Organizations |                |                             |           |
| Chair                        |                |                             |           |
| Member                       |                |                             |           |
| Assigned Administrative Duties (e.g., Program Director; Student Advisor) | | | |

| Scholarly/Professional Organizations/State Committees or Educational Agencies |                |                             |           |
| Conference hosted (e.g., Role)                                                   |                |                             |           |
| Conference Activities (e.g., Role)                                               |                |                             |           |
| Organization/Committee/Agency (e.g., Role)                                        |                |                             |           |
| State                                                                               |                |                             |           |
| Regional                                                                            |                |                             |           |
| National                                                                            |                |                             |           |
| International                                                                     |                |                             |           |

| Community Engagement |                |                             |           |
| Presentations        |                |                             |           |
| Workshops/Seminars   |                |                             |           |
| Consulting           |                |                             |           |
| Service Grants       |                |                             |           |
| Board: Office/Members|                |                             |           |
| Committee: Officer/Member|            |                             |           |
| Volunteer Service (not as an official member of board or committee)             |                |                             |           |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Other</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Faculty may submit other service activities as evidence to support or that further reflects their academic expertise.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

7 Expectations are based on an assigned workload of 18 units of teaching (60% effort); 6 units of scholarship (20% effort); and 6 units of service (20%). Faculty workloads adjusted from an 18 unit teaching assignment will result in higher/lower expectations in scholarship/service activities and must be documented in annual faculty evaluations, as well as supported by evidence from the Department Chair.
Appendix D

College of Education
Eligibility and Summary Recommendations Form
Promotion and/or Tenure

Candidate completes Items 1-3; Candidate and Department Chair complete Item 4

1. Name: ______________________________________________________________________
   (Last) (First) (Middle)

2. The individual named above is applying for: ______ promotion ______ tenure
   (check either or both)

3. Proposed Rank and Title: _______________________________________________________
   (e.g., Associate Professor of Elementary Ed.)
   Present Rank and Title: ___________________________________________ Year Awarded: ______

4. Eligibility: (See BSU Policy 4340 and 4370; College of Education Promotion and
   Tenure Policy and Procedures.)
   Yes No Faculty member meets eligibility criteria for Tenure Review
   Yes No Faculty member meets eligibility criteria for Promotion Review

   Candidate Signature ____________________________ Date: ______
   Department Chair Signature ______________________ Date: ______

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recommendation</th>
<th>Department P&amp;T</th>
<th>Department Chair</th>
<th>COE P&amp;T</th>
<th>Dean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tenure</td>
<td>Promotion</td>
<td>Tenure</td>
<td>Promotion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Candidate Notified</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chair Signature</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Candidate Signature</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix E

College of Education
Promotion & Tenure Materials Checklist and Timeline

**September 15** - the following materials should be submitted to the Department Chair:

- Eligibility and Summary Recommendation Form (Candidate completes Items 1-3; Candidate and Department Chair complete Item 4)
- Letter of application (statement of role)
- Completed portfolio (See the College of Education Promotion and Tenure Policy and Procedures, Section 5.)
  - Vita
  - Evidence of teaching effectiveness
  - Evidence of scholarly activities
  - Evidence of service
  - Secure and un-editable electronic copy of the P&T Portfolio Vita
- Department requirements for Promotion and Tenure which augment the University or College policy have been acknowledged and addressed in this file

**September 30** - Department Promotion and Tenure review completed and candidate notified of recommendation

**October 5** - Candidate responds by signing Eligibility and Summary Recommendation Form
  (Attach response to recommendation if desired.)

**October 10** - Department Chair review completed; candidate notified of recommendation.

**October 15** - Candidate responds by signing Eligibility and Summary Recommendation Form
  (Attach response to recommendation if desired.)

**October 15** - Department Chair forwards the portfolio and recommendation to the College of Education Promotion and Tenure Committee.

**December 1** - College of Education Promotion and Tenure Committee review completed;
candidate notified of recommendation.

**December 6** - Candidate responds by signing Eligibility and Summary Recommendation Form  (Attach response to recommendation if desired.) Candidate appeal due/request meeting with College of Education Promotion and Tenure Committee, if desired.  (See College of Education Promotion & Tenure Policy and Procedures, Item 8.2.)

**December 15** - College of Education Promotion and Tenure Committee forwards portfolio and recommendation to the Dean.

**January 15** - College of Education Dean notifies each candidate of recommendation to be forwarded to the Provost and Academic Vice-President.

**January 20** - Candidate responds by signing Eligibility and Summary Recommendation Form (Attach response to recommendation if desired.) Candidate appeal due/request meeting with Dean, if desired.  (See College of Education Promotion & Tenure Policy and Procedures, Item 8.2.)

**January 31** - Dean forwards all promotion and tenure recommendations to the Provost and Academic Vice-President.

**April 15** (or within 15 days after the State Board of Education meeting) - President informs candidates of the action of the Board.
THE P & T Task Force recommends that a grace period of three years (until May 2011) be extended to associate professors for the purpose of promotion to the rank of professor under the Promotion and Tenure policy that was in place upon hire. This grace period would afford faculty members the opportunity to work towards the new Promotion and Tenure policy, and at the same time, would allow them to be held accountable to the scholarly activity requirements in place when they were hired. At the end of the three year grace period all associate professors would be promoted under the new policy.